

R.B. Duggan. O.P.

S. Mary's - Book.
1936,

Scriptural.



THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL
TO THE CORINTHIANS

THE EPISTLES OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS

WITH INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMENTARY

BY

REV. JOSEPH MACRORY, D.D.

VICE-PRESIDENT AND PROFESSOR OF SACRED SCRIPTURE
MAYNOOTH COLLEGE

NOW

CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF ARMAGH

AND

PRIMATE OF ALL IRELAND

Dublin

M. H. GILL AND SON, LTD.

1935

Rekt. Obstat:

PATRICIUS DARGAN,

Censor Theol. Deput.

Imprimi. Potest:

† EDUARDUS,

Archiep. Dublinen.,

Hiberniæ Primas.

DUBLIN, die 6^a Novembris, 1915.

<i>First Edition</i>	<i>..</i>	<i>1915</i>
<i>Second</i>	<i>..</i>	<i>1917</i>
<i>Third</i>	<i>..</i>	<i>1915</i>

Printed and Bound in Ireland at the Press of the Publishers.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION 	vii
PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION 	ix
INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE	
I. Corinth and its Church 	xiii
II. Authenticity and Integrity of Epistle ...	xviii
III. Occasion, Object and Plan 	xx
IV. Place and Date 	xxii
V. General Characteristics, Style and Vocabulary 	xxiii
VI. Quotations from the Old Testament ...	xxvi
VII. Authorities for the Text 	xxvi
1. Greek Uncial MSS. 	xxvi
2. Greek Cursive MSS. 	xxvii
3. Versions 	xxvii
4. Quotations in the Fathers ...	xxix
VIII. Commentaries 	xxix
TEXT OF FIRST EPISTLE AND NOTES 	1
INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EPISTLE	
I. Authenticity and Integrity 	273
II. Historical Situation, Occasion, Object and Plan 	274
III. Place and Date 	279
IV. General Characteristics, Style and Vocabulary 	280
V. Quotations from the Old Testament ...	282
VI. Authorities for the Text 	282
VII. Commentaries 	283
TEXT OF SECOND EPISTLE AND NOTES 	285
INDEX TO THE TWO EPISTLES 	445

PREFACE TO THIRD EDITION

WHEN the Second Edition of this work had been exhausted, I found that the cost of producing books had risen so much that I should either lose money on a new Edition or sell the book at a price that I was unwilling to ask from ecclesiastical students, for whose use it was chiefly intended. Owing to a long continuance of these conditions the work has been out of print for many years. In allowing it to be reprinted now, I do so only at the urgent request of several Colleges.

The work remains substantially the same as in the previous Editions: no changes of importance, and extremely few of any kind, have been made.

I desire to thank the eminent firm of M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., for the great care and trouble they have taken, and on their own responsibility, in the printing of this Edition. For their sake I hope the work will meet with as warm a reception now as was accorded it in the past. In that event, I think they will have reason to be satisfied.

✙ J. CARDINAL MACRORY.

Armagh.

All Saints' Day, 1935.

PREFACE TO FIRST EDITION

CATHOLIC commentaries in English on the Epistles to the Corinthians, indeed on any of the Pauline Epistles, are so very few that no apology seems needed for venturing to add to their number.

The present work is chiefly intended as a text-book for the students of my own classes of Sacred Scripture in Maynooth College ; but I shall be pleased if it also secure a place among the text-books of other colleges at home and abroad or be used by priests on the mission to refresh the knowledge they acquired in student days. In preparing a text-book for those who are to be made acquainted with a subject for the first time, the difficulty is to say just enough—to set forth the essentials with clearness and precision, and not to overlay them with unnecessary erudition or excessive detail. I am not at all sure that I have always succeeded in this, but I have tried throughout to aim at it, and while endeavouring to omit nothing of real importance, have laboured to be as clear and brief as possible. Indeed I might honestly say that it would not have cost me half the labour to make this work twice its present size.

Some slight acquaintance with Greek, the original language of nearly the whole New Testament, is supposed in my readers ; but it is hoped that even where this is wanting, the commentary will be intelligible. It is greatly to be desired, however, that every serious student of the New Testament should have the Greek text before him or, better still, a Graeco-Latin New Testament, containing the Vulgate version together with the original.

It is my hope and intention to publish before long, if God spare me, commentaries of a somewhat similar kind on the other Pauline and the Catholic Epistles. I have been led to begin with the Epistles to the Corinthians, partly for a personal reason, but chiefly on account of their great beauty and importance. The writer of the article on these Epistles in *The Catholic Encyclopedia* does not hesitate to say that the First “ is generally regarded as the greatest of the writings of St. Paul by reason of the magnificence and beauty of its style and the variety and

importance of its contents"; and that the Second "gives a deeper insight than any other of his writings into the character and personal history" of the Apostle. It would indeed be difficult to exaggerate the importance especially of the First Epistle. Its teaching on the indissolubility of the bond of Christian marriage, its glorious eulogy of charity, its unique testimony to the wealth of spiritual gifts with which the Holy Ghost enriched the infant Church, the light it throws on a great Christian community at so early a period as the middle of the first century, the confirmation it supplies of the Gospel accounts of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist, the evidence it affords that the Blessed Eucharist was regularly celebrated before the year 60 A.D., the proofs it furnishes of the great fundamental doctrine of our Lord's resurrection, the arguments by which it establishes the final and glorious resurrection of the just—all this enables us to realise how much poorer we should have been, if the First Epistle to the Corinthians had never been written. And as for the Second Epistle, if it contained nothing of importance besides St. Paul's enumeration of his trials and sufferings endured for the Gospel, it would still be one of the most precious and inspiring portions of the New Testament.

As a general rule, I have abstained from discussing any but the more probable opinions on disputed texts; and I have frequently contented myself with such refutation of erroneous or less probable views as is contained in setting forth and firmly establishing the true sense. As must happen to everyone who desires to write carefully on St. Paul, I have had to read much, but, except in questions of great importance, I have rarely thought it necessary to give a long list of authorities in support of an opinion. Similarly in cases of disputed readings, where the reading is fairly certain I have generally thought it enough to say so; but in important or very doubtful readings I have always taken care to give the authorities in support of each, that the reader may be able to exercise his own judgment.

It would be impossible for me, if I desired, to apportion my indebtedness to the various authors upon whom I have drawn. In the course of long years of reading, much is imbibed and assimilated unconsciously. I think, however, that I am most indebted to St. Chrysostom, St. Thomas, Estius and Cornely, among Catholic commentators; and to Robertson-Plummer, Stanley, Conybeare-Howson and Zahn, among Protestant commentators and writers. From Grimm's excellent "Lexicon

Graeco-Latinum in Libros N.T." I have learned much, as also from the Grammars of New Testament Greek by Beelen, Winer-Moulton, and James Hope Moulton.

As the Latin Vulgate is the official text of the Catholic Church, I have printed it side by side with our English version ; but I trust everyone who reads the commentary will be satisfied that I have never lost sight of the original Greek. The Latin text is a reprint of the Latin Vulgate published at Turin in 1883 : *Biblia Sacra Vulgatae Editionis, Sixti V. Pont. Max. jussu recognita, et Clementis VIII. auctoritate edita. Editio emendatissima, Indicis Congreg. decreto probata, et iterum hoc anno evulgata. Augustae Taurinorum, typis Hyacinthi Marietti, 1883.* The English text is from the Rhemish New Testament approved by Cardinal Wiseman, and published by Burns and Oates. I regret that my notes on First Corinthians were already in print before the new *Westminster Version* of the Bible began to appear ; for this reason I have seldom been able to refer to that version.

In parting with this book, I am keenly sensible of its short comings, but I hope that, even such as it is, it may be the means of helping many to a fuller knowledge and a deeper appreciation of two of the most beautiful and important Epistles of the New Testament.

J. M. R.

MAYNOOTH,

Jan. 18, 1915.

INTRODUCTION TO THE FIRST EPISTLE

I. CORINTH AND ITS CHURCH

1. The ancient city of Corinth, to which Cicero refers as "*totius Graeciae lumen*" (*Pro Lege Manil.* 5), was destroyed by the Roman consul Mummius in 146 B.C. Just a century afterwards, in 46 B.C., a new city, *Colonia Julia Corinthus*, was founded by Julius Caesar on the old site, and in 27 B.C. this new city was constituted by Augustus, capital of the Roman province of Achaia under the title of *Colonia Julia Augusta Corinthus*.

After its restoration Corinth rose rapidly in commercial and general importance, chiefly owing to its remarkably advantageous natural position. Situated at the Southern extremity of the narrow isthmus that connects the Peloponnesus with the mainland of Greece, with two good harbours, Lechaëum on the West, and Cenchreæ on the East, giving it access respectively to the Ionian and Aegean seas, it was naturally fitted to be a highway of commerce between Rome and the East. The celebration of the Isthmian games in its neighbourhood, made it, notwithstanding the large admixture of Roman colonists among its inhabitants, a centre of Greek life; while the residence there of the Roman proconsul added greatly to its importance and distinction. Though inferior to Athens as an intellectual centre, it was remarkable even in this respect, especially in connection with rhetoric and philosophy (cf. St. Chrys. on 1 Cor. hom. i, 1; Sueton., *Tiber.* 34). As Rob.-Plumm. (Introd., p. xii) remark, "it was proud of its political priority, proud of its commercial supremacy, proud also of its mental activity and acuteness, although in this last particular it was surpassed, and perhaps greatly surpassed, by Athens." In one other respect it had an unenviable distinction. The ancient city was notorious for its immorality; a thousand harlots attached to its temple of Aphrodite Pandemos, lived a life of vice as part of the worship of the goddess, and κορινθιάζοντες, "to live like a Corinthian," was synonymous with the grossest profligacy; and though we cannot be sure that the new city was

as immoral as the old, there is enough evidence to show that it bore and deserved a very bad reputation.

The population of the city was very cosmopolitan in character. The descendants of the Roman colonists, together with officials of the Roman government, and Roman merchants who settled there for commercial reasons, probably formed the greater part of what would be regarded as the aristocracy; the bulk of the lower classes was composed of native Greeks, while Orientals of various nationalities, notably Jews (cf. Acts xviii. 4) were largely represented. But, notwithstanding this motley character of its inhabitants, Corinth was still a Greek city; the vernacular was Greek, the literature was Greek, the customs and even the laws were Greek.

II. It was on his second Apostolic journey that St. Paul, after traversing Asia Minor, crossing from Troas to Europe (Acts xvi. 11), and preaching in Macedonia and Athens, arrived in Corinth (Acts xviii. 1). The precise year of his arrival cannot be determined with certainty, but most probably it lay within the years 50-52 A.D.* Having obtained lodging in the house of a Jewish couple, tent-makers like himself, named Aquila and Priscilla (otherwise "Prisca"), who had recently arrived from Italy on the occasion of the expulsion of the Jews by Claudius (Acts xviii. 2; cf. *Sueton. Claud.* 25), he proceeded to work for wages in their tent-shop during the week, and to preach to the Jews in the synagogue every Sabbath. Meantime Silas and Timothy, who had been left behind in Macedonia (Acts xvii. 14), rejoined him; and after their arrival he preached more insistently, testifying to the Jews that Jesus was the Messiah (Acts xviii. 5). "But they gainsaying and blaspheming, he shook his garments, and said to them: Your blood be upon your own heads: I am clean; from henceforth I will go unto the Gentiles. And departing thence, he entered into the house of a certain man, named Titus Justus, one that worshipped God, whose house was adjoining to the synagogue" (Acts xviii. 6-7). St. Luke adds that Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, believed with all his house, and that many of the Corinthians believed and were baptised. Thus the nucleus of a Christian society, apart and distinct from the synagogue, was formed at Corinth.

Now that a good beginning had been made, it would seem that St. Paul was thinking of retiring from the city, probably

* See below, *Introd.* IV. 2.

on account of the opposition of the Jews, but the Lord appeared to him by night in a vision, and said to him : " Do not fear, but speak, and hold not thy peace, because I am with thee : and no man shall set upon thee to hurt thee ; for I have much people in this city " (Acts xviii. 9-10). In consequence of this vision he remained on, with the result that his stay at Corinth on the occasion of this his first visit lasted for a year and a half (Acts xviii. 11). During this period he seems to have preached and founded churches through all Achaia, as we gather from 1 Cor. i. 2 ; 2 Cor. i. 1 ; 1 Thess. i. 7 ; Rom. xvi. 1.

The bulk of the converts were Gentiles. This may be inferred from St. Luke's narrative, where he records the breach with the synagogue and mentions only Crispus and his household as Jewish converts ; and it is proved by the Apostle's own words, where he speaks of the converts as having been formerly idolators (1 Cor. xii. 2), which could not be said of those who had formerly professed the Jewish religion. Most of the converts were poor and unlettered ; there were " not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble " (1 Cor. i. 26), but of course there were some exceptions. Crispus was one ; Erastus the treasurer of the city was another (Rom. xvi. 23) ; Gaius* was another (1 Cor. i. 14) ; so probably were Fortunatus and Achaicus (1 Cor. xvi. 17), and doubtless there were others of whom we have no mention. Stephanas (1 Cor. i. 16) was hardly a Corinthian, for he seems to be distinguished in 1 Cor. i. 14-16 from the Corinthians whom Paul had baptised, and in 1 Cor. xvi. 17 he and his household (and they only, according to the best reading) are spoken of as the *first-fruits* of Achaia. It is likely that he belonged to Athens, where Paul had preached before coming to Corinth. But while the converts thus embraced some Jews, and a few wealthy and educated personages, all the evidence goes to show that the great body of them were poor and uneducated Gentiles.

During the Apostle's stay in Corinth the Jews with one accord rose up against him, and brought him before the judgment seat of the proconsul Gallio, brother of the more famous Seneca, accusing him of teaching men to worship God contrary to the law. But before the Apostle had time to begin his defence, Gallio, perceiving that the question was one about words and

* The Greek preserves the correct form of this name, which has been often wrongly written Caius, the mistake being due to the fact that the same character originally stood in Latin for both G and C.

names, and really about the violation of the Mosaic, not the Roman law, dismissed the case, and drove Sosthenes the accuser, who had succeeded Crispus as ruler of the synagogue, from his presence (Acts xviii. 12-16). Some think that St. Paul then quitted Corinth for a time, and made the journey to Illyria referred to in Rom. xv. 19, but nowhere mentioned in Acts; and certainly no more likely time for that journey can be suggested. Just as in Acts ix. 19-23 St. Luke makes no mention of St. Paul's journey to Arabia (Gal. i. 17), yet leaves room for it in the "many days" of verse 23, so in Acts xviii. 18 the Apostle's stay of "yet many days" in Corinth after the Gallio affair, may have been subsequent to a mission to and return from Illyria (cf. Corn., p. 3, note). If this be correct, this return from Illyria furnishes a second visit of the Apostle to Corinth, and enables us to understand how he speaks in 2 Cor. xiii. 1 of an intended visit as his *third*, although St. Luke has recorded only one prior to the time in question.*

At last, after "many days" he says goodbye to the brethren, and accompanied by Priscilla and Aquila sails for Ephesus, where he leaves them; then continues his journey to Caesarea, Jerusalem, and back to Syrian Antioch (Acts xviii. 18-22). And now the young church of Corinth, bereft of its father's presence, soon began to experience the truth so often experienced elsewhere since, that grace does not supplant nature, nor the glorious faith of Christ shut out the weaknesses and temptations of the world. As we learn from our First Epistle, dissensions and rivalries about leaders sprang up, and factions appeared calling themselves respectively after Paul, and Apollos, and Cephas (i. 11 ff.); one of the brethren had been guilty of scandalous immorality, yet no steps had been taken by the Corinthian church to exclude him from its membership (v. 1 ff.); disputes among the faithful were brought before heathen tribunals instead of being settled among themselves (vi. 1 ff.); fornication was apparently regarded by some as a thing indifferent (vi. 12 ff.); doubts or disputes existed regarding various practical questions, such as the use of marriage (vii. 1 ff.), and partaking of meats that had been offered to idols (viii. 1 ff.); the Blessed Eucharist was treated irreverently in their liturgical meetings (xi. 20 ff.); there was much that was

* If the return from Illyria be not the second visit, then that visit must be assigned, with Zahn and others, to the period of the three years' stay at Ephesus. At any rate, we are satisfied that our Second Epistle supposes two visits already paid to Corinth by the Apostle before it was written.

disedifying and blameworthy in connection with their appreciation and use of charisms (xii., xiv.); and finally some among them denied the doctrine of the resurrection of the body (xv. 12). Thus, although doubtless many of the Corinthian Christians deserved the praise with which our First Epistle opens (i. 4 ff.), yet the condition of the church as a whole was far from satisfactory even within the first few years from its foundation, and there seemed grave danger lest the Apostle's labours might turn out to have been largely in vain.

Though our Epistle throws so much light upon many aspects of the Corinthian church, strangely enough neither it nor the Second Epistle tells us anything as to the hierarchical condition of the church there, or the precise nature of its governing body. One might read both Epistles without even suspecting, except for the apparently accidental references to the Blessed Eucharist in 1 Cor. x. 15 ff.; xi. 23 ff., that there was either bishop or priest in Achaia. This is due, without doubt, to the fact that the Apostle takes the constitution of the church for granted, just as he would apparently have taken for granted the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist and passed it over in silence, had he not been led to refer to it, in one case in order to illustrate his argument against participation in the sacrificial banquets of the heathen (x. 16 ff.), and in the other in order to reprobate the abuses in connection with it (xi. 20 ff.). This attitude of the Apostle becomes all the more intelligible, if we reflect that the letter of the Corinthians, referred to in 1 Cor. vii. 1, had probably been forwarded to him by the ecclesiastical superiors of Corinth, and that his own letters were in turn probably communicated to the church through them.

At any rate, there is no room for doubt that a hierarchy of some kind had already been set up by the Apostle in Corinth and the other principal churches of Achaia. The fact that the Blessed Eucharist was celebrated, is proof of the presence of priests there; for the Eucharist was never consecrated without a bishop or a priest, as is distinctly implied before the end of the first century by both the *Didache* xv. 1 and the epistle of St. Clement of Rome, xl. 4 (cf. Funk, *Patres Apostolici*). Moreover, there can be no doubt that St. Paul had organised the churches of Achaia in the same way that he organised other churches before and after. Now, before he preached in Corinth, he and Barnabas had set up in Galatia "presbyters in every church, having prayed with fastings" (Acts xiv. 22); before

then, too, "bishops" and deacons had been appointed in Philippi (Phil. i. 1), and "superiors in the Lord" in Thessalonica (1 Thess. v. 12). And afterwards, in the church of Ephesus, another Pauline foundation, we find "presbyters," to whom the Apostle could say, as we learn on the now unchallenged authority of St. Luke: "Take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost placed you 'bishops' (*ἐποκόπους*) to rule the church of God, which He purchased with His own blood" (Acts xx. 28); and in Crete he left Titus behind him to "appoint presbyters in every city" (Tit. i. 5).

From all this we may safely conclude that the Corinthian church and all the churches of Achaia were regularly organized, and had ecclesiastical superiors, at least priests and deacons, ordained like St. Timothy by "imposition of the hands of the priesthood" (1 Tim. iv. 14; cf. 2 Tim. i. 6). Whether all or some of those priests were also bishops or merely priests, the place of the bishop of later times being taken by the Apostle, is a much disputed question, which the Epistles to the Corinthians will not enable us to decide, and which need not detain us here.

II. AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE

1. The Pauline authorship of the Epistle is established by such convincing evidence, both external and internal, and is so generally admitted, that there is no need to delay long upon the question. The fact is, there is no other book of the New Testament, the authenticity of which is established so unquestionably.

Before the end of the first century (about 95 A.D.) we have a direct appeal to it, as the work of St. Paul, by St. Clement of Rome: "Take up the epistle of the blessed Paul the Apostle. What did he first write to you at the beginning of the Gospel? Of a truth he wrote in the Spirit to you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollon, because even then you formed factions" (1 Clem. xlvii.; cf. 1 Cor. i. 12). In the first decade of the second century, St. Ignatius of Antioch, though he does not formally quote the epistle, shows the greatest familiarity with it. "Ignatius must have known this epistle almost by heart. Although there are no quotations (in the strictest sense, with

mention of the source), echoes of its language and thoughts pervade the whole of his writings in such a manner as to leave no doubt whatever that he was acquainted with the First Epistle to the Corinthians" (*The N.T. in the Apostolic Fathers*, 1905, p. 67). Before the middle of the second century, St. Polycarp quotes from vi. 2 of the epistle, at the same time declaring it to be the teaching of St. Paul: "Or do we not know that the saints shall judge the world as Paul teaches?" (Polyc., *Ad Phil.* xi. 2); and about 177 A.D., Athenagoras quotes part of xv. 35 with the formula κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον (*De Res. Mort.* xviii). When we add that St. Irenaeus has more than 60 quotations from it, Clement of Alexandria more than 130, and Tertullian more than 400; and that it was known to the second century heretics Basilides and Marcion, the latter even admitting it into his very restricted canon, it will be evident how overwhelming is the external evidence in its favour even within the first two centuries from its appearance.

The internal evidence is altogether in harmony with the external. The whole Epistle breathes the spirit of St. Paul; it agrees with his doctrine in other epistles; it confirms, and is in turn confirmed by what we know of the Corinthian church from Acts and other sources. It is no wonder, therefore, that it was always received in all the churches as the genuine work of St. Paul, and that extreme rationalists like Bauer, Loman, van Manen, etc., have only made themselves ridiculous by questioning its authenticity.

2. As to its *integrity*, there is no reasonable ground for doubting it. The entire epistle is contained in the four great Uncial MSS. B & A D. "Ignatius shows acquaintance with every chapter, with the possible exception of viii, xi, xiii, xiv. Irenaeus quotes from every chapter, excepting iv, xiv, and xvi. Tertullian goes through it to the end of xv (*Adv. Marc.* v. 5-10), and he quotes from xvi. The Epistle reads quite intelligibly and smoothly as we have it; and, it does not follow that, because it would read still more smoothly if this or that passage were ejected, therefore the Epistle was not written as it has come down to us. As Jülicher remarks, 'what is convenient is not always right.' Till better reasons are produced for rearranging it, or for rejecting parts of it, we may be content to read it as being still in the form in which the Apostle dictated it" (Rob.-Plum., *Introd.*, p. xix).

III. OCCASION, OBJECT AND PLAN

1. The occasion which led to the writing of the Epistle was twofold. First, the abuses referred to above in I. 2 had evidently come to the Apostle's knowledge. We know from Acts that on his third apostolic journey (Acts xviii, 23 ff.) he settled down for three years at Ephesus (Acts xx. 31); and as intercourse between Corinth and Ephesus was frequent except during the winter months, the passage taking less than a week in favourable weather, we might naturally conclude that the condition of the Corinthian church would not long remain unknown to him. The Epistle itself makes it clear that this was in fact so; it also reveals to us some of the sources of his information. From the household of a lady named Chloe (i. 11) he learned of dissensions which threatened to rend the Corinthian church; from Apollos, who had preached in Corinth after the Apostle's departure (Acts xix. 1), but was now back again in Ephesus (xvi. 12), he doubtless learned much, as well as from three legates of the Corinthian church, Stephanas, Fortunatus and Achaicus, who had recently come to him at Ephesus (xvi. 7). Doubtless he had also other sources of information, and the unsatisfactory condition of the church to which all bore witness was one of the reasons that led him to write the Epistle.

The other reason was that the Corinthians had written to him,* asking his opinion upon certain questions connected with marriage and celibacy, the eating of meats offered to idols, etc. (vii. 1; viii. 1, etc.), and most of the second part of the Epistle is taken up with a statement of his views upon these questions.

2. The object of the Epistle was accordingly twofold: (a) to denounce and correct the abuses, and (b) to answer the questions that had been put to him by letter.

3. The plan corresponds to this twofold occasion and object, embracing besides the introduction and conclusion two parts: one directed against abuses (i. 10-vi. 20); the other mainly replying to the letter from Corinth (vii. 1-xvi. 12). That most of the second part refers to matters mentioned in the letter of the Corinthians is clear, for this part opens with the words *καὶ ἄν ὑπερσῶμι ὑμῖν* ("now concerning the things about which you wrote to me"), which possibly refer to all that follows and with

* This letter is lost and must have been lost at a very early period. The same must be said of a letter of Paul to the Corinthians referred to in v. 9 of the present epistle.

the like formula, *περὶ δὲ τῶν παρεόντων* in vii. 25, at least cover the matters dealt with in chapter vii. A similar formula, *περὶ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* is found in viii. 1, and it implies that the section on the eating of meats offered to idols, viii-x, was written in reply to the Corinthians' letter. Similarly chapters xii-xiv are covered by the *περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν* of xii. 1, and parts of chapter xvi. by the *περὶ τῆς λογικῆς* and *περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ* of xvi. 1 and xvi. 12. There remain then only chapters xi and xv in neither of which have we anything corresponding to the formula *περὶ δὲ κ.τ.λ.* Yet chapter xi also was probably written in view of the Corinthians' letter, even if it also takes account of oral reports (xi. 18), for xi. 16 seems to imply that something had been said by the Corinthians about certain people being contentious in regard to the head-dress of women, treated of in the section xi. 3-16; and the closing words of xi. 34: "but the rest I will set in order, when I come," seem to imply that the Apostle had been asked for some directions as to the celebration of the Eucharist. In regard to chapter xv, which treats of the resurrection of the just, it may be that the Apostle speaks of his own initiative on account of things he had heard (xv. 12), reserving the treatment of this weighty subject for the close of the Epistle for greater emphasis, though even here we cannot be sure that the letter of the Corinthians had not referred to the matter.

The plan may therefore be sketched in brief outline as follows :
Introduction (i. 1-9), containing salutation, and an expression of thanksgiving and hope.

First Part (i. 10-vi. 20), reprehending the vices of the Corinthians :

- (a) their dissensions and factions (i. 10-iv. 21).
- (b) their non-avoidance of sinners (v. 1-13).
- (c) their bringing their disputes before pagan tribunals (vi. 1-11).
- (d) their fornications (vi. 12-20).

Second Part (vii. 1-xvi. 12), replying to the letter of the Corinthians :

- (a) in reference to marriage and celibacy (vii. 1-40).
- (b) in reference to meats offered to idols (viii. 1-xi. 1).
- (c) in reference to the head-dress of women (xi. 2-16).
- (d) in reference to the conduct of the love-feasts (xi. 17-34).
- (e) in reference to the appreciation and use of charisms (xii. 1-xiv. 40).

(f) in reference to the resurrection of the just (xv. 1-58).

(g) in reference to the collection for the poor, and other matters suggested by the mention of it (xvi. 1-11).

(h) in reference to Apollos (xvi. 12).

Conclusion (xvi. 13-24), containing exhortation, directions, salutations, warning and benediction.

IV. PLACE AND DATE

1. The place where the Epistle was written was certainly Ephesus or its neighbourhood, for the Apostle at the close of the Epistle says that he was staying on at Ephesus until the following Pentecost (xvi. 8). Many authorities, however, misunderstanding the meaning of xvi. 8, where the Apostle does not say that he is passing through Macedonia, but expresses his present determination to pass through it afterwards on his way to Corinth, supposed that the Epistle was written at Philippi in Macedonia, but this is undoubtedly a mistake, as xvi. 8 proves clearly.

2. The precise date is not so easily determined. The general Pauline chronology is uncertain to the extent of a few years, and this uncertainty attaches to the date of our Epistle. We have just seen that it was written at Ephesus, and since in the light of xvi. 8-9 it cannot have been written during the brief stay at Ephesus (Acts xviii. 19-21) on the return from the second Apostolic journey, it must have been written during the three years' stay there (Acts xx. 31) on the third Apostolic journey. Moreover, it was written towards the close of that three years, when Timothy had crossed to Europe (xvi. 10; Acts xix. 22), and when the Apostle himself was thinking of leaving Ephesus (xvi. 8; Acts xix. 21). If, therefore, we could date the third Apostolic journey, we could date our Epistle. But unfortunately the date of that journey is itself uncertain. Thus among Catholic scholars Patrizi assigns it to 50-53 A.D.; Cornely, to 55-59; and among Protestant scholars Harnack, to 50-53; Turner, to 52-56; Ramsay, to 53-57; and Lightfoot and Zahn, to 54-58.* Such discrepancy among competent scholars who have carefully investigated the question goes far to prove that the data for

* Patrizi, *Comment. in Act.*; Corn., *Introd.*, vol. III., p. 370 ff.; Harn., *Chronologie d. Altkrist.* Lu. I., pp. 233-244; Turn., article on Chronology in *Haering's Dict. of the Bible*; Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller, and Explorer*, 1890, p. 336; Lightfoot, *Biblical Essays*, pp. 216-233; Zahn, *Introd.*, vol. III., p. 482 f.

definitely deciding it are wanting. Without attempting here to enter into the whole question of the Pauline chronology, which will be treated more appropriately in connection with Acts, we will content ourselves with the following few remarks. The most crucial date for settling the Pauline chronology is that of the recall of Felix and succession of Festus (Acts xxiv. 27). We consider it most probable that this occurred in 58 A.D. (for reasons see Turner, in the article on Chronology already referred to). But the recall of Felix followed upon St. Paul's two years' imprisonment at Caesarea, which must therefore have begun in 56; and the Caesarean imprisonment followed immediately upon the third Apostolic journey, which with its progress through Asia Minor, three years' stay at Ephesus, journey through Macedonia, three months' stay at Corinth (Acts xx. 3), return through Macedonia, and voyage to Palestine, cannot have taken less than four years—52–56 A.D. Now we have seen already that our Epistle must have been written during this journey, towards the close of the three years' stay at Ephesus, and not very long before the feast of Pentecost (xvi. 8); and since it cannot have been written during the last year of that journey, seeing that St. Paul was in Macedonia at the Pasch (Acts xx. 6), and meant to be in Jerusalem at the Pentecost, of that year (Acts xx. 16), we may conclude that it was most probably written in the Spring of 55 A.D. (xvi. 8), perhaps about the time of the Paschal festival (v. 7, 8).

V. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS, STYLE AND VOCABULARY

1. One marked characteristic of the Epistle is the great variety of topics it treats, in which respect it far surpasses any other epistle of the New Testament. Connected with this and partly arising out of it, is the very considerable insight that it gives us into the spiritual condition of a young Christian community in a great Gentile church. We see the tares already springing up amid the wheat, so that while nothing is wanting to them in any grace (i. 7), there is yet faction, and impurity, and litigation among the Corinthian Christians. We see their anxious doubts in regard to such questions as the use of marriage by Christians already in the married state or the lawfulness of contracting it for those still single, we are enabled to realise the various practical issues that daily confronted them in regard to the eating of

meats offered to idols, the unconventional character of their women, such as was to be apprehended in a city that was new, and cosmopolitan, and devoid of an ancient aristocracy, the abuses connected with those evening celebrations at which the Blessed Eucharist was then received in Corinth, the doubts of some in regard to such a fundamental question as the resurrection of the body ; and in the midst of all this the wondrous abundance of spiritual gifts, with which God watered, as it were, the young plant of the faith, and the marvellous extent of which would never have been known to us but for this Epistle. The dominant note of the Epistle is one of reprobation and censure. With the exception of the general praise implied in the thanksgiving of the first chapter (cv. 2-7), there is hardly a word of unqualified compliment in the whole Epistle, while throughout there is much censure and some terrible threats (iii. 2-3, 17 ; iv. 8 ff. ; v. 2 ; vi. 9 ; viii. 1 ; x. 1 ff. ; xi. 17 ff. ; xi. 29 ; xiv. 35 ; xv. 12 ; xvi. 22). Notwithstanding this, the Apostle's paternal affection appears at times—they are his children, his most dear children (iv. 14, etc.)—but it is affection deliberately manifested in the hope of winning back erring children, rather than the spontaneous love of a father who felt that his love was deserved and requited. If we compare our Epistle with the others written during the Aegean, or middle period of his missionary activity, we find that the personal note is much more prominent than in Romans, but less so than in Second Corinthians or Galatians (if indeed the latter belongs to this period). He feels with sorrow that his name has been made a watchword of faction (i. 12 ff.), that he has probably been criticised and judged (iv. 4), possibly that his claim to Apostleship has been covertly questioned by some (ix. 1 ff.), but there is no sign that he has yet been openly attacked, nor any trace of the warm and indignant defence of himself and denunciation of adversaries, such as mark the Second Epistle to the Corinthians or that to the Galatians.

The *style* is the normal Pauline style, that of a Hellenistic Jew who, though not unacquainted with " literary " Greek, was more familiar with the Septuagint version and with the common Greek of his native city of Tarsus. If it lacks the subtle play of mood, the versatile use of particles, the artistic periodic structure, the ease and elegance, of classical Greek, it has at the same time a most striking vividness of its own, and a singular strength and power which made St. Jerome say that he seemed to himself, as often as he read Paul, to hear not words but *peals*

of thunder (Ad Pammach., ep. xlviii). We have said that it is the Apostle's normal style; it is not by any means so argumentative as the style of the Epistle to the Romans, as might naturally be expected, since there the Apostle is mainly engaged in developing and establishing one great thesis, while here he is setting forth and reprehending various abuses or replying to a list of questions. Nor is it so varied or so vehement as the style of Second Corinthians, where his zeal is roused and his indignation kindled against open enemies who sought by every means to calumniate him and destroy his influence with his Corinthian children. There is nothing in our Epistle to compare with the wonderful play of feeling, the biting sarcasm, the passionate apology or, if we except the glorious eulogy of charity in 1 Cor. xiii, and some passages of chapter xv, the sustained eloquence that mark many passages of the Second Epistle. On the whole, it may be said that the style of our Epistle is fairly clear and simple, and if difficulties present themselves, as indeed they do, they are generally due to other causes.

3. One or two points connected with the *vocabulary* call for mention. The Epistle contains nearly 100 words which occur nowhere else in the New Testament; and somewhat more than 100 which, though, occurring elsewhere in the New Testament, are not found in any other epistle of St. Paul, with the exception of a few that occur in Hebrews. Both lists of words may be seen set out at length in Rob.-Plum., *Introd.*, pp. xlix.-li, where they are accompanied by the following suggestive remarks: "The extent of these two lists warns us to be cautious when we use vocabulary as an argument with regard to authorship. Statistics with regard to First Corinthians are all the more valuable, both because of the length of the Epistle, and also because the authorship is certain on quite other grounds. Putting the two lists together, we have nearly 220 words in First Corinthians, which are not found in any other of the Pauline epistles. A fact of that kind puts us on our guard against giving great weight to the argument that Ephesians, or Colossians, or the Pastoral Epistles, cannot have been written by the Apostle, because of the large number of words in each of them which do not occur in any other letter written by him." Four or five words are common to this Epistle and one or more of the Pastorals, but are not found elsewhere in the New Testament; and a considerable number common to this Epistle and the Pastorals, though found elsewhere in the New Testament, are not met with in an

other epistle of St. Paul. It is unnecessary to point out that all such links between the Pastorals and a certainly genuine epistle are of the greatest value, and deserve to be carefully noted.

VI. QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

The Epistle contains some thirty quotations from the Old Testament, a larger number than is found in any other epistle except Romans and Hebrews. These quotations are from eleven different books, and Isaiah is quoted as many as eight times. In several instances the quotation resembles more than one passage of the Old Testament, and we cannot be quite sure which passage the Apostle had in view ; in others, there appears to be a conflation of two passages. All the quotations are short, and were probably made from memory, without reference to a manuscript. In at least four instances : ii. 9 ; iii. 19 ; xiv. 21 ; xv. 54, the Apostle seems to have had the Hebrew text of the passage before his mind ; in the others, he agrees exactly or at least substantially with the Septuagint or diverges considerably in a few cases from both Hebrew and Septuagint. Sometimes he seems to make slight changes in order to adapt the quotation to his context, as in i. 19 and iii. 20, where in the first case he substitutes *ἀνθρώπων* for *κράτος*, and in the second, *οὐρανόν* for *ἀστέρας*.

VII. AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT

The First Epistle to the Corinthians is preserved wholly or partially in the following authorities :

1. *Greek Uncial MSS.*

- B (Fourth century). The Vatican MS., the best MS. of the Greek Bible in existence ; in Rome.
- g (Fourth century). The Sinaitic MS., the only MS. containing the whole New Testament ; now in the British Museum.
- A (Fifth century). Codex Alexandrinus ; in British Museum.
- C (Fifth century). Codex Ephraem, a palimpsest ; in Paris.
- D (Sixth century). Codex Bezae Cantabrigiae, a Graeco-Latin MS. ; in Paris.
- E (Ninth century). A copy of D, unimportant ; in Petrograd.
- F (Late Ninth century). Codex Augiensis, very like G ; in Trinity College, Cambridge.

- F* (Seventh century). Coisl. i.; in Paris.
 G (Late Ninth century). Codex B rnerianus; in Dresden.
 H (Sixth century). Coislinianus 202; scattered in seven different libraries, having been used for bindings.
 I^a (Fifth century). Codex Muralti; in Petrograd.
 K (Ninth century). Codex Mosquensis; in Moscow.
 L (Ninth century). Codex Angelicus; in Rome.
 M (Ninth century). Codex Ruber; in British Museum.
 P (Ninth century). Codex Porphyrianus; in Kiew.
   (Fifth century). Porphyrianus Chiovensis; the only papyrus uncial MS. of the New Testament; in Kiew.
   (Eighth or Ninth century). Codex Athous Laurae, 172; in Mount Athos.
 S (Eighth or Ninth century). Codex Athous Laurae; in Mount Athos.
   (Fifth century). A palimpsest; in Rome.

Of these MSS. B   A L   contain the whole of First Corinthians, C D F G K P nearly the whole, while the remainder contain only fragments.*

2. Greek Cursive MSS.

There are nearly 500 cursive MSS. containing more or less of the Epistles of St. Paul, and about 300 that contain the First Epistle to the Corinthians. None of them is earlier than the ninth century, and they all follow that later recension of the text that is known as Byzantine. Yet it was on the evidence of a few of them that the Greek *Textus Receptus* was settled in the sixteenth century. The best of them do not approach in critical value the oldest of our uncials.

3. Versions

(a) The *Vetus Itala* (Vet. It.), or Old Latin (second century). Its text of this Epistle is preserved in the Graeco-Latin uncials D E F G, and is cited as d e f g. "d has a text independent of D, but in places adapted to it; e approximates more to the Vulgate; g is a Vulgate text *except in Romans and 1 Corinthians*, where it is based on the Old Latin; f a Vulgate text with Old Latin admixture. The Greek text of each of these MSS. has to

* For further particulars regarding these MSS. see Scrivener's *Introd. to the Criticism of the New Testament*, Fourth Edition, vol. I. pp. 90-130 and pp. 173-186, and Gregory's *Canon and Text of the New Testament*, pp. 329-369.

some extent influenced the Latin " (Rob.-Plum.). The Old Latin text of this Epistle is contained also in a ninth century MS. X, and fragments of it in two others cited as m (Cod. Nessorianus, Rome) and n (Cod. Frisingensis, Munich).

(b) The Vulgate (Vulg.), or St. Jerome's correction of the Old Latin (fourth century). It is preserved in a very large number of MSS., the oldest of which are known as Codex Fuldensis (sixth century), Amiatinus (eighth century), Toletanus (eighth century), Demidovianus (ninth century), Harleianus (ninth century), etc.

(c) The Syriac (Syr.). The Epistles of St. Paul are all contained in the Peshitto Version, which is ascribed to Rabbula, Bishop of Edessa (early fifth century). Several ancient and excellent manuscripts of the version are extant. So far no satisfactory critical edition of the *Corpus Paulinum* has been published. A convenient edition is supplied by the British Bible Society: *The New Testament in Syriac*; London, 1905-1920.

The Peshitto Version is a revision of an ancient Syriac Version of which no manuscripts are known. It may be possible eventually to reconstruct portions of this older version from the writings of Aphraates and St. Ephrem.

Some manuscripts of the later so-called Harklean, or Heracleon Version, containing our two Pauline Epistles to the Corinthians, are available.

(d) Coptic (Copt.), or Egyptian (third century), in four dialects, (a) Bohairic (or Memphitic), (b) Sahidic (or Thebaic), (c) Achmimic, and (d) Fayoumic. Of (c) and (d) only fragments remain. The Bohairic New Testament is complete, and very considerable portions of the Sahidic New Testament exist. The Bohairic text of the Epistles is contained in the critical work of Horner: *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic and Bohairic*, Vol. iii (Oxford 1905). The Sahidic Version is published in a critical edition by Horner in his work: *The Coptic Version of the New Testament in the Southern Dialect, otherwise called Sahidic and Thebaic*, Vol. iv (Oxford 1920). Recently a very valuable study of the Sahidic text has been published by Thompson: *The Coptic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Pauline Epistles in the Sahidic Dialect* (Cambridge 1932).

(e) The Aethiopic (Aeth.), of fourth or fifth century.

(f) The Gothic (Goth.), of fourth century.

(g) The Armenian (Arm.), of fifth century.

4. *Quotations in the Fathers*

As the Fathers of the first three or four centuries frequently quoted from our Epistle as from other parts of Scripture, it is obvious that if we could be sure of the exact form of the quotation their evidence would be most valuable; but as there was always a tendency in scribes, as there is in printers, to assimilate the quotation to the received text, caution is needed, and reliance can be placed only on critically edited Patristic texts.

VIII. COMMENTARIES

A good list of Commentaries, ancient and modern, on this Epistle may be seen in Cornely's *Prolegomena* to his Commentary on the Epistle, pp. 11, 12. His own work is probably the most exhaustive exposition of the Epistle that has ever appeared. Estius of course is excellent and still unsurpassed in many respects, but despite his great ability and critical acumen he was handicapped by the fact that many of the best MSS. were unknown in his time. With these, as in the first rank, we would place St. Chrysostom, whose forty-four homilies (Migne, P. G., 61) are full of keen and illuminating criticism, Theodoret (Migne, P.G. 82), and St. Thomas Aquinas. In addition to the works named by Cornely, we would mention Callan's *Epistles of St. Paul*, Vol. i, New York 1922; Allo's *St. Paul, Première Épître aux Corinthiens*, Paris 1935; Van Steenkiste's *S. Pauli Epistolae breviter explicatae*, and the brief but solid and scholarly *Notes on St. Paul* by Fr. Joseph Rickaby, S.J.

Cornely does not mention any English Protestant Commentaries on the Epistle, but they are very numerous. Among the best are those of Alford (6th ed., 1871), Stanley (4th ed., 1876), Evans (1881, in the *Speaker's Commentary*), Ellicott (1887), Lightfoot—posthumous *Notes on i-vii* (1895), Ramsay (in *The Expositor*, 6th series), Robertson and Plummer (1911, in *The Internat. Crit. Comm.*). A non-Catholic work of great value on all Pauline questions, and generally speaking safe and inoffensive, is Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul*. Zahn's *Einführung in das Neue Testament* has been translated into English: *Introduction to the New Testament*, in 3 vols. (1909), and is a marvellous storehouse of very full and scholarly information on all introductory questions connected with the Pauline Epistles, and indeed all other parts of the New Testament.

FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS

CHAPTER I

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

In the introduction to the Epistle (vv. 1-9) the Apostle begins with a salutation (1-3), to which succeeds a thanksgiving for past divine favours conferred upon the Corinthian Church (4-7), and the expression of a well-grounded hope for the continuance of such favours in the future (8-9). Then the body of the Epistle opens with a solemn appeal against divisions and in behalf of unity (10), followed by a brief account of the nature of these divisions as reported to him (11-12), a summary reprobation of them (13), and a thanksgiving to God that St. Paul himself had given no occasion for them (14-17). As one of the chief causes of these divisions was an undue importance attached by the Corinthian Christians to worldly learning and eloquence in their teachers, the Apostle now shows that it was by Christ's authority and for the greater glory of the Cross of Christ that he had preached as he did (17-18). Such a Gospel had been foretold (19); and whether account be taken of the Christian preachers (20) or the doctrine they preached (21-25) or the converts they made (26-28), God has set the wisdom of the world at nought, in order that the triumph of the Christian faith may not be due to human means (29), but to God alone in Christ Jesus (30-31).

¹ PAULUS vocatus apostolus IESU CHRISTI per voluntatem Dei, et Sosthenes frater,	¹ PAUL called to be an apostle of JESUS CHRIST, by the will of God, and Sosthenes a
---	--

1. The Apostle begins by declaring his Apostolic dignity. Many have held that he does so because his authority had been already questioned at Corinth. This is possible, but it must be borne in mind that in other Epistles where there could be no such motive, he begins by asserting his Apostleship (1 Tim. i. 1; 2 Tim. i. 1; Tit. i. 1). An opening reference to it was natural in order to lend weight to his words.

* *Ecclesiae Dei, quae est Corinthi, sanctificatis in CHRISTO IESU, vocatis sanctis, cum omnibus qui invocant nomen*

brother. * To the church of God that is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in CHRIST JESUS, called to be saints, with all that invoke the name of our

"Called to be an Apostle." This rendering of *κλητὸς ἀπόστολος*, which is that of the Rheims version, is adopted also by the Revised Version. The words, which occur elsewhere in combination only in Rom. i. 1, prove that St. Paul had a Divine call to the office of Apostle. They hardly prove, what we know otherwise to be the fact (Acts ix. 15, 16), that he was called immediately by Christ, for in the next verse here we have the phrase "called to be saints" applied to the Christians of Achaia or of Corinth itself, and it cannot be meant that they were called immediately by Christ without man's intervention. It is not clear whether we ought to read "Jesus Christ" with *κ A L P*, Syr., Copt., Arm., Aeth., or "Christ Jesus" with *B D E F G 17*, Am. The point is not important, but has interest in connection with the Apostle's general usage.*

"By the will of God." It was God's will, not his own desire nor man's choice, that was the cause of St. Paul's being raised to the dignity of the Apostleship. God's will, then, which is equivalent to God's command (1 Tim. i. 1), had imposed upon him not only the dignity but also the duties of an Apostle.

"And Sosthenes the brother." Sosthenes must have been well and favourably known to the Christians of Corinth, seeing that St. Paul associates him with himself in this salutation. The only person of the name mentioned in Scripture was the Ruler of the Synagogue in Corinth on the occasion of the Apostle's first visit to the city (Acts xviii. 17). Very probably it is he that is referred to here. If so, he had already embraced the Christian faith, and was now with St. Paul at Ephesus. Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, pp. 37, 142) shows that long before Christians employed it in this sense, *ἀδελφός* (brother) was used of a fellow-member of a religious body.

2. "To the Church of God that is at Corinth." *Ἐκκλησία* which the Latins borrowed, designated in classical Greek the plenary deliberative assembly of all the free citizens of a city. With St. Paul it means sometimes a local assembly of the faithful (xi. 18); then, in a wider sense, as here, all the faithful of a city

* For particulars see *Internal Crit. Comm.* on Rom. i. 1.

Domini nostri IESU CHRISTI, in Lord JESUS CHRIST in every
omni loco, ipsorum et nostro. place of theirs and ours.

or district ; then, in a still wider sense, all the faithful—the Church, as we say now (*e.g.*, x. 32 ; xv. 9 ; Gal. i. 13).*

"To them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus." Many good authorities read this clause immediately after "to the Church of God," and before "that is at Corinth." Whichever reading be followed, the sense is that in Baptism the members of the Church have been cleansed from their sins and sanctified, separated from the world and united in Christ Jesus to the God of sanctity. The plural ἡγιασμένων; coming after the collective singular, is probably meant to give prominence to the individual responsibility of the sanctified ; while the perfect participle does not merely mean, as the aorist would, that they were once sanctified, but implies that their sanctity still does or ought to continue.

"Called to be saints." As remarked already, this cannot mean that the Corinthian Christians had been called immediately by Christ. They had been called by God, but through the immediate agency of St. Paul and his fellow-workers. It is very significant that St. Paul habitually speaks of all Christians as "saints" (vi. 1, 2 ; xiv. 33 ; xvi. 1, 15 ; Rom. i. 7 ; viii. 27 ; xv. 25, 26, 31, etc.), implying thereby that all are sanctified in Baptism, and called to a life of holiness.

"With all that invoke the name," etc. If this clause is to be connected with the opening words of the verse, as seems more probable, then the sense is that the Apostle salutes not only the church of Corinth, but with it all the Christians of the Roman Province of Achaia, of which Corinth was the capital (*cf.* 2 Cor. i. 1). The words : "in every place of theirs and ours" will then mean : in all the places that have Corinth for their metropolis, and us for their Apostles, and the same people will thus be saluted as in 2 Cor. i. 1. Others prefer to connect the present clause with "called to be saints," and then the meaning is that the Apostle salutes the Corinthian Christians, who are called to be saints with the same call given to all who invoke the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place. In this view the last words of the verse : "of theirs and ours" are most naturally connected with "the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ," as though the Apostle wrote : Did I say of our Lord ! Rather I ought to

* Cf. Batiffol, *Primitive Catholicism*, pp. 70-73.

* *Gratia vobis et pax a Deo Patre nostro, et Domino Iesu Christo.* ¹ Grace to you, and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord JESUS CHRIST.

say "of their Lord and ours." In neither of these views is the salutation directed to all the churches of the world; in the first it is directed to all the churches of Achaia, in the second to the church of Corinth alone; and certainly no view of the verse can be correct which would extend the salutation to all Christians and make the Epistle "Catholic," for such a view is opposed to the whole tenor of the Epistle, which attends throughout to the needs and circumstances of a particular church or at most of the churches of a particular locality.

3. In *v. 1* we have the senders of the greeting, in *v. 2* the recipients, and here the greeting itself. This form of salutation, with very slight changes in a few instances, is used by St. Paul in the beginning of all his Epistles. By "grace" some understand with *Estius* (on *Rom. i. 7*) all the gratuitous gifts of God that lead to salvation, and by "peace" the calm and undisturbed possession of them—that holy and happy calm which the world can neither give nor take away. This peace is indeed itself a grace, but it is the fruit of all the others and their crown, and perhaps for this reason is mentioned separately. Others understand by "grace" God's favour or goodwill (*Luke i. 30*), and by "peace" all spiritual blessings flowing from that goodwill as their cause.

"From God our Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ." It follows from this that to St. Paul Jesus Christ was God, since He is regarded equally with the Father as the source of grace and peace. For the gratuitous gifts that lead to Heaven can have only God as their source. Christ, then, is the source of grace, nor can the words be fairly interpreted in any other sense. Grammatically, indeed, they could mean "from God the Father of us and of our Lord Jesus Christ," and in that case there would be no argument afforded by the present text for Christ's Divinity, but that meaning is absolutely excluded by many parallel passages, where *ἡμεῖς* does not occur and where the formula is: "from God the Father, and from the Lord Jesus Christ" (*Gal. i. 3*; *Eph. vi. 23*; *2 Tim. i. 2*; *Tit. i. 4*; *2 Cor. xiii. 3*; *Philem. 25*). By "God our Father" is meant here the First Divine Person. The Blessed Trinity could indeed be called "our Father," as in the Lord's Prayer, but the mention of the

⁴ Gratias ago Deo meo semper pro vobis in gratia Dei, quae data est vobis in CHRISTO IESU. ⁵ Quod in omnibus divites facti estis in illo, in omni verbo, et in omni scientia : ⁶ Sicut testimonium Christi

⁴ I give thanks to my God always for you for the grace of God that is given you in CHRIST JESUS. ⁵ That in all things you are made rich in Him, in all utterance, and in all knowledge ; ⁶ As the testi-

Second Divine Person here immediately after, shows that the First Person is meant. As Christ can be called Lord without excluding the Father from Lordship, so the Father is called God without excluding Christ from Divinity.

4. " My " before " God " is wanting in some ancient authorities. The Apostle, now using the singular number and speaking only in his own name—for Sosthenes was not joint author—thanks God for the graces bestowed upon the Corinthians at their conversion, and before going on to blame, tries to conciliate them.—" That was given you in Christ Jesus." The aorist looks back to the time of their conversion ; and " in Christ Jesus " possibly means not only through Him, but as united with Him, like the branches in the vine (John xv. 4, 5).

5. " That " (or " because ") " in all things you are (rather ' were ') made rich in Him." In all things, or in everything (ἐν παντί) conducing to their salvation they had been enriched in Christ at the time of their conversion and Baptism. Some think that the form of expression alludes to the commercial prosperity of Corinth, in which the Christians, as a rule, did not share, but for the want of which they were now more than compensated.—" In all utterance, and in all knowledge " (ἐν παντί λόγῳ καὶ πάσῃ γνῶσει). It is very doubtful if " utterance " gives the sense of λόγος here. Why in that case does it precede knowledge, since the knowledge of divine truths is prior to the apt expression of them ? We prefer with St. Thomas : " in verbo doctrinae, et in intelligentia eorum quae ad salutem pertinent," to understand λόγῳ of the doctrine preached to them (Gal. vi. 6 ; 1 Thess. i. 6 ; 2 Thess. iv. 2), and γνῶσει of their understanding of it. Every doctrine that they were fit to receive (iii. 2) had been preached to them, and they had understood it. There is no probability in the view that λόγος here refers to the gift of Tongues, which is nowhere so called ; γνῶσις is here a Divine gift with no evil implication, such as attached to it later on, after the rise of Gnosticism.

6. Καθώς makes a difficult connection here, and is variously

confirmatum est in vobis :
 'Ita ut nihil vobis desit in
 ulla gratia, expectantibus re-
 velationem Domini nostri IESU
 CHRISTI. 'Qui et confirmabit
 vos usque in finem sine crimine,
 in die adventus Domini nostri

mony of Christ was confirmed
 in you. 'So that nothing is
 wanting to you in any grace,
 waiting for the manifestation
 of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.
 'Who also will confirm you
 unto the end without crime,
 in the day of the coming of our

understood. It seems best to take it to mean "according as"
 or "even as." They were made rich in all doctrine and in all
 knowledge (v. 5), *according as* the testimony borne to Christ
 (objective genitive) by the Apostolic preaching was confirmed
 among them by being brought home to their conviction. Or,
 they were made rich . . . *even as* the testimony . . . was con-
 firmed among them (by manifold signs and graces, the allusion
 being to the wealth of charisms, of which the Apostle speaks in
 chapters xii and xiv). Estius understands verse 5 of their being
 enriched at their conversion with the *charisms* of knowledge and
 utterance (xii. 8), and takes the present verse to mean that by
 such gifts their conversion was proved to be real : "Hujusmodi
 donis (nempe sermone et scientia), velut certo firmoque testimonio
 cognoscitur vos esse fideles ac servos Christi, ejusque spiritum
 accipere."

7. "So that nothing is wanting," etc. The Greek might mean
 "so that you are behind (no other church) in any grace." The
 connection is with "you were made rich" in v. 5. Though
χρησιμα is used, the remaining words of the verse seem to prove
 that not merely *gratiae gratis datae* are meant, for their fullness
 of graces appears to be given as a reason why they wait in con-
 fidence for the coming of Christ at the day of judgment
 (cf. 2 Thess. i. 7).

8. The sense is : Who shall also confirm you to the end, that
 ye be unblamable in the day, etc. "Who" is referred by many
 to "Jesus Christ," nor does the repetition of the Holy Name
 instead of the possessive pronoun in the end of the verse disprove
 this (see e.g. v. 3, 4 ; 2 Cor. i. 5). But on the whole, it seems
 more likely that the reference is to God (r. 4), to whom the
 preceding thanksgiving has been offered. The best attested
 reading of the last clause of the verse is : "in the day of our
 Lord Jesus Christ." Some ancient authorities, however, read
 "in the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," while the Vulgate
 combines both readings.

IESU CHRISTI. * *Fidelis Deus : per quem vocati estis in societatem Filii eius IESU CHRISTI Domini nostri.*

¹⁰ *Obsecro autem vos fratres, per nomen Domini nostri IESU CHRISTI, ut idipsum dicatis omnes et non sint in vobis schismata : sitis autem perfecti in eodem sensu et in eadem*

Lord JESUS CHRIST. * *God is faithful : by whom you are called unto the fellowship of His Son JESUS CHRIST our Lord.*

¹⁰ *Now I beseech you, brethren, by the name of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, that you all speak the same thing, and that there be no schisms among you : but that you be perfect in the same mind and in the same*

9. The connection with the preceding is : God shall confirm you, for He is faithful to perfect what He began in you. They had been called into fellowship with Christ in being made sons of God.

In view of the Arian objection against Christ's Divinity from such passages as John i. 3, note that *ἐν ᾧ* is here used of a principal efficient cause (cf. Heb. ii. 10 ; Rom. xi. 36).

From the preceding verses (4-9) it is clear that many of the Corinthians had received very abundant graces and had corresponded with them, clear also that there was solid ground for hoping that they would persevere ; but while this was so, it is equally clear, as we shall see, that many were unworthy, and fell very far short of the perfection required of them.

10. The body of the Epistle now begins, and the Apostle proceeds to animadvert upon abuses (i. 10-vi. 20). And turning first (i. 10-iv. 21) to the divisions and parties which existed among them, he opens with a solemn exhortation or appeal through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, which they in common with all Christians invoked, and which ought to be for them a bond of union. He exhorts to external unity, first positively : " that you all speak the same thing " ; then negatively : " that there be no schisms among you." *Σχισμά* is literally a fissure or rent (Matt. ix. 16) ; then, metaphorically, a division, which may be more or less serious. Nor is external unity enough, and hence he goes on to exhort them " to be perfect in the same mind, and in the same judgment." *Καταρτίζαν* may mean to repair what has been broken or injured (Matt. iv. 21) or simply to make perfect (Luke vi. 40). Both meanings may very well be combined here ; they ought to forget all their divisions, and be perfected in the same mind and in the same judgment. These last words are taken by some to mean that they should hold the same

sententia. ¹¹ Significatum est enim mihi de vobis fratres mei, ab iis qui sunt Chloes, quia contentiones sunt inter vos.

¹² Hoc autem dico, quod unusquisque vestrum dicit : Ego quidem sum Pauli : ego autem Apollo : ego vero Cephae : ego

judgment. ¹¹ For it hath been signified unto me, my brethren, of you, by them that are of the house of Chloe, that there are contentions among you.

¹² Now this I say that every one of you saith : I indeed am of Paul : and I am of Apollo : and I of Cephas : and I of

principles, and deduce the same conclusions, whether theoretical or practical. But the more probable opinion seems to be that "mind" refers to the speculative view of the understanding, "judgment" to the practical decision arrived at. So St. Chrys., Just., Euseb., etc.

11. He now shows why he has thought the preceding exhortation necessary, and proceeds to set forth what he has heard of their dissensions. We cannot be sure whether the vague genitive of dependence, "those of Chloe," refers to the children or brethren or domestics of Chloe, but most likely the last is right. Nor do we know whether Chloe belonged to Corinth or to Ephesus. She is mentioned, indeed, as a person known to the Corinthians, but she might have lived in Corinth for a time and then removed to Ephesus. In any case, it is unlikely that St. Paul's informants were returning to Corinth, for if they were, the Apostle would hardly give them as the source of his information, lest he should bring trouble upon them.

12. *Ἄνω ἑὶ καθέως* i.e., now I mean this. It is plain that many of the Corinthians ("each one of you") were involved in these contentions, but we are not to suppose that all without exception took part. Even stronger language in xiv. 26 ; 2 Thess. i. 3 cannot be taken to imply absolute universality.—St. Peter is always referred to as Cephas by St. Paul, except in Gal. ii. 7, 8, where the Greek Πέτρος is used.

We take it that three factions are referred to, and three only, and that the words "but I (ἐγὼ ἑὶ) of Christ" are not meant as the watchword of a faction that rejected all human authority, but either represent the views of some right-minded Corinthians or are added by St. Paul in his own person in order to reject at once the other foolish watchwords to which he has just referred. The probability of this latter view would be much more apparent if the words "but I of Christ" stood, as they might, in the beginning of c. 13. That only three factions are referred to, and

autem Christi. ¹³ Divisus est Christus. ¹³ Is Christ divided? Christus? Numquid Paulus crucifixus est pro vobis? aut Was Paul then crucified for in nomine Pauli baptizati you? or were you baptized in

that the words "but I of Christ" are not the watchword of a faction, seems to follow (1) from the character of the argument in the next verse: "Was Paul, then, crucified for you, or were you baptised, etc.?"—an argument which would have no force against a faction that claimed Christ for its Head. (2) From iii. 21, 22, where Paul, Apollos, and Cephas appear as apparently the only names that had given rise to factions. (3) From the fact that in iii. 23 the Apostle tells all his readers "but you are Christ's" (ὁμοῖς ἢ Χριστοῦ), the very expression used in the last clause of the present verse. (4) St. Clement of Rome, in his *Epistle to the Corinthians*, written about 97 A.D., refers to only three factions: "Take up the epistle of the blessed Apostle Paul. What did he write to you at the time when the Gospel first began to be preached? Truly, in the Spirit he wrote to you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos, because even then you formed parties" (Ch. 47).

Three factions then are referred to, nor is there any good reason to doubt that the real names of those whom they professed to follow are given. Many, indeed, have held on account of iv. 6: "but these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and to Apollos for your sakes," that the real names of the heads of these factions are suppressed by St. Paul through motives of charity or prudence; but St. Clement, almost a contemporary, seems to imply clearly that the factions were really named after Paul, Cephas, and Apollos. Some of the Corinthians, then, gloried foolishly in Paul as their leader; others despising, perhaps, Paul's preaching, admired the eloquence of Apollos (see Acts xviii. 24), while others again preferred Peter to both and refused to recognise Paul's authority. The latter were probably Judaizers, who may not have yet gone so far as to teach the binding force of the Mosaic Law in the New Dispensation, but had probably begun to teach useless and frivolous doctrines about Jewish privileges (cf. iii. 12).

13. The Apostle proceeds to confound these factionists. "Is Christ divided?" The succeeding interrogations, as well as the general sense, make it more probable that this clause is interrogative, and not exclamatory. Christ had founded one Church

estis ! ¹⁴ Gratias ago Deo quod the name of Paul ? ¹⁴ I give
neminem vestrum baptizavi, God thanks, that I baptized

of which He was to be the one Head. Now, to this Head all the Corinthians to whom the Apostle writes still claimed to belong, for they were still Christians. But if their church was split up into contending factions, each claiming Christ for its Head, yet quarrelling with the others, then Christ as Head of one faction must quarrel with Himself as Head of the others. Hence the Apostle asks is Christ in this way divided against Himself ? That this is the meaning of the interrogation, seems most probable from Matt. xii. 26 ; Mark iii. 26, where the same verb *μαρτυρεῖ* is used in reference to Satan divided against himself. — " Was Paul crucified for you " ? In their factious spirit, while they extolled the claims of those whom they had chosen as their respective leaders, they seemed to forget who it was that had the real and sovereign claim on their allegiance. To Christ they belonged, because He had redeemed them by His death on the cross, and because in Baptism they had been consecrated to Him, nay, made members of a mystic body having Him as its Head (Cf. vi. 15 ; xii. 13, 27 ; Eph. iv. 15, 16 ; v. 30).

Hence the Apostle asks : Did I (and he might have added, or Apollos, or Cephas) redeem you ? or were you made followers of mine in Baptism ? The clause *ἢ εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, κ.τ.λ.* would be better rendered : " or were you baptised unto (or ' into ') the name of Paul " ? (cf. x. 2). This form, which is the usual one (in Acts ii. 38 we have *ἐν τῷ* and in Acts x. 48 *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*) is indeed always rendered by the Vulgate " in nomine," but it ought to be remembered that in later Latin " in " with the ablative was often used for " in " with the accusative. The phrase, then, does not mean that Baptism was conferred by invoking the name of Christ, but that it was conferred *unto* the name of Christ, so as to make those who were baptised followers of Christ. Though many of the Scholastics on account of texts like this held that Baptism was for a time conferred in the name of Christ only and not in the name of the Blessed Trinity, this view must be rejected. Baptism was always conferred with the formula commanded by Christ Himself (Matt. xxviii. 19), as is proved by the *Didache*, vii. 1 : " Baptise in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost in living water."

14. " I give God thanks " (*εὐχαριστῶ τῷ θεῷ*). This is the most

nisi Crispum et Caium : ¹⁴ Ne quis dicat quod in nomine meo baptizati estis. ¹⁵ Baptizavi autem et Stephanæ domum : ceterum nescio si quem alium baptizaverim.

¹⁷ Non enim misit me Christus baptizare sed evangelizare : non

none of you, but Crispus and Caius : ¹⁵ Lest any should say that you were baptized in my name. ¹⁶ And I baptized also the household of Stephanas : besides, I know not whether I baptized any other.

¹⁷ For Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the

probable reading. Some early authorities insert *you* after *θεῶν*, while others read only *ἐν ὀνόματι*. The meaning, however, is the same. As some might think that they were in a manner bound as followers to him who had baptised them, the Apostle thanks God that he had given little occasion for this error in his own case.

Crispus had been ruler of the Synagogue in Corinth before Sosthenes on the occasion of St. Paul's first visit (Acts xviii. 8, 17), and Caius (rather Gaius) was the Apostle's host there when he wrote to the Romans (Rom. xvi. 23) during his third visit to Corinth (Acts xx. 2, 3).

15. "Lest any should say that you were baptized (*ἐβαπτίσθητε*) unto my name." An almost equally probable reading is : "Lest any should say that I baptised (*ἐβάπτισα*) unto my name."

16. Stephanas is mentioned again (xvi. 15, 17), as among the first converts of Achaia, and one of the legates sent from Corinth to the Apostle before this letter was written. The uncertainty expressed in the last clause of this verse is no argument against the inspiration of the words. Why might not the Apostle be left in doubt, and inspired to express his doubt, if God so willed ? And there was good reason for expressing the doubt here, for it shows how little weight the Apostle had attached to Baptism by himself (since he did not remember whom he baptised), and therefore how far he was from supposing that those baptised were to become his followers.

17. He now gives the reason why he had not baptised many. It is because his first duty was to preach. It is a common Hebraism that when one thing is preferred to another, the one is affirmed, the other denied or rejected. Hence St. Paul was sent not so much to baptise as to preach. Some taking the words of this verse strictly have held that Paul, unlike the other Apostles (Matt. xxviii. 19), had no command to baptise, but only permission to do so if he chose. Since, however, he was a true Apostle, we cannot doubt that the command given to the

in sapientia verbi, ut non evacuetur crux Christi. ¹⁸ Verbum enim crucis, pereuntibus quidem stultitia est : iis autem qui salvi fiunt, id est nobis, Dei virtus

gospel : not in the wisdom of speech, lest the cross of Christ should be made void. ¹⁸ For the word of the cross, to them indeed that perish, is foolishness : but to them that are

Twelve extended also to him ; but by them and him the command was sufficiently complied with if they took care that Baptism was conferred by some inferior minister. Thus St. Peter, when he had personally instructed Cornelius and those come together at his house, " commanded them to be baptised " (Acts x. 48) and did not baptise them himself. It matters comparatively little who confers a Sacrament, but the sanctity, ability, and character of a preacher are all-important (cf. John iv. 2).

" Not in wisdom of speech, lest the cross of Christ should be made void." There is a transition here, and the Apostle now passes on from the divisions and factions themselves to speak of one of their chief causes. The Corinthians attached too much importance to human learning and eloquence in their preachers, and St. Paul now shows them that it was not God's will that the Gospel should be propagated at first by such human means. From this point to iii. 4 the language seems directed specially against the followers of the eloquent Apollos. " Wisdom of speech " probably refers to the matter as well as the form of his preaching, to erudition, whether of the Greek philosophers or Jewish scribes, as well as to eloquent language. All this he had eschewed, and in accordance with the will of Christ who sent him to preach. Preachers of later times, who have neither the inspired simplicity nor the miraculous powers of the Apostles, may freely avail themselves of the help of eloquence and erudition : but the Apostle says here that it was Christ's will that in his case there should be no such display, lest the success of his preaching should be attributed to such human means, and " the cross of Christ," i.e., the death of Christ and the Gospel of a crucified Saviour, be robbed of the glory which was due to its own inherent efficacy.

18. That Christ did not send him to preach in wisdom of speech is shown by the fact that the Gospel of a crucified Saviour which he preached, is folly to those who are unbelieving and in the way of perdition, though to those like himself and his readers who " are being saved," i.e., who are in the way of salvation.

est. ¹⁸ Scriptum est enim :
Perdam sapientiam sapientium,
et prudentiam prudentium re-
probabo. ¹⁹ Ubi sapiens ? ubi
scriba ? ubi conquisitor huius

it is a power of God. We might have expected that in contrast with the first clause the Gospel would be spoken of in the second as the wisdom of God, but to show that it is no merely speculative or inoperative system, the propriety of the antithesis is disregarded, and the Gospel is declared to be a power, a mighty force, of God (Cf. Rom. i. 16).

19. He now shows by a text from the Old Testament that such a Gospel as he preached had been foretold. The quotation is from Is. xxix. 14 according to the LXX. The Apostle alters the text slightly by changing "I will hide" (κρύψω) into "I will set aside" (ἀφαιρήσω). In the passage of Isaiah from which the quotation is taken, God promises to deliver the Jews by a great miracle from the Assyrian king, Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.), and to confound and show to be vain the wisdom of those Jews who relied on their own prudence or on Egyptian help for deliverance, "hoping for help in the strength of Pharaoh and trusting in the shadow of Egypt" (Is. xxx. 2). What thus referred literally to certain Jews in the time of Sennacherib referred mystically to the bulk of the learned in the time of Christ and the Apostles, and God by another miracle, namely, by redemption through the cross of His Son, was again to deliver His people, and once more confound the wisdom of those, whether Jews or Greeks, who should seek for deliverance through any other means. That the text of Isaiah referred to the times of Christ in some sense either literal or mystical, and is not merely accommodated here, is proved not only by the manner in which St. Paul cites it ("for it is written"), but from the fact that the verse of Isaiah immediately preceding (Is. xxix. 13) was declared by our Lord Himself to have reference to His contemporaries : "Hypocrites, well did Isaiah prophecy of you, saying : This people honoureth me with their lips," etc. (Matt. xv. 7, 8).

20. The event had proved the truth of the prophecy and shown that the Gospel was not to be preached in "wisdom of speech," for whether we look to the preachers (v. 20), or to the doctrine preached (21-25), or to the character of those who accepted it and became Christians (26-28), God had set the wisdom of the

saved, that is, to us, it is the power of God. ¹⁹ For it is written : *I will destroy the wisdom of the wise ; and the prudence of the prudent I will reject.* ²⁰ *Where is the wise ?*

sæculi ! Nonne stultam fecit Deus sapientiam huius mundi ! *Where is the scribe ? Where is the disputer of this world ?*
 " Nam quia in Dei sapientia Hath not God made foolish the non cognovit mundus per sa- wisdom of this world ! " For

world at nought, in order that the glory may be neither to man nor to human means (29), but all may be due to God alone in Christ Jesus (30-31).

There may be a reminiscence here of Ia. xxxiii. 18, but the departure from both the Hebrew and the LXX, is so great that we think the Apostle is not quoting. The last words : " of this world," are more probably to be connected with each of the preceding substantives : " Where is the wise, where is the scribe, where is the disputer, of this world " !

Different views have been held as to the distinction between the wise, the scribe, and the disputer. Some refer the first to Gentile philosophers, the second to the Jewish doctors, and the third to the subtle disputers from among either class. Others prefer to take " the wise " to refer to all the learned ; then two classes are mentioned : the Jewish doctors, and the Gentile philosophers. The last clause of the verse asks triumphantly : Hath not God by His action, in not making use of it, shown the wisdom of this world to be foolish ! Τοῦτον at the end of the verse is doubtful : it is wanting in the oldest Greek MSS., but represented in all the versions.

It will be remarked that the word " world " occurs twice in this verse, but represents two different words, αἰών and κόσμος, in the original. Αἰών involves the notion of transitory duration, as in English we speak of the spirit of the age. Sometimes οὗτος ὁ αἰών means in the New Testament the whole time up to the day of judgment (Matt. xii. 32 ; Tit. ii. 12), and then " the age to come " is the time of Christ's glorious reign after the day of judgment (L. xx. 35) ; but oftener, especially in St. Paul, " this age " or " the present age " designates (consistently with the use of הַיָּמִים הַזֵּהִם by the Jewish Rabbis) the ante-Messianic period or rather that period as still virtually enduring for unbelievers after the coming of Christ. Hence in our text, " the disputer of this age " is one who still belonged to the ante-Messianic period because of his unbelief. See also ii. 6-8 ; Rom. xii. 2, etc. (Cf. Grimm on αἰών).

21. God had dispensed with the services of the learned, and rejected the world's wisdom, in the preaching of the Gospel (20),

pientiam Deum : placuit Deo
per stultitiam praedicationis
salvos facere credentes.

²² Quoniam et Iudaei signa
petunt, et Graeci sapientiam
quaerunt : ²³ Nos autem prae-

seeing that in the wisdom of
God the world by wisdom knew
not God ; it pleased God by
the foolishness of *our* preaching
to save them that believe.
²² For both the Jews require
signs, and the Greeks seek after
wisdom : ²³ But we preach

for (γάρ) he decreed to save those who believe by a Gospel which
the world regards as folly (21).

"In the wisdom of God." Some take this to refer to God's
providence, which in its dealing with the religious progress of
mankind permitted ignorance for a time (Acts xvii. 30 ; Rom.
xi. 32 ; Acts xiv. 16). But the more common view is that the
reference is to God's wisdom as displayed in creation or in both
creation and revelation. The sense then is : seeing that the
world through its wisdom (as a means to knowledge—*δύναμις*) failed
to know God *practically*, though it had the evidences of His
wisdom manifested to it in creation and revelation, God was
pleased through the foolishness of that which the Apostles
preached (τοῦ κηρύγματος), i.e., redemption through a crucified
Messiah (23), to save them that believe. The world was not
converted by God's wisdom, and so He confounded it by saving,
not the world, but believers through what seemed folly. The
antithesis between the beginning and the end of the verse proves
that there is question in the beginning of practical knowledge,
for because men failed to know, God was pleased not merely to
teach but to *save*. Hence there is no contradiction between this
and Rom. i. 19, 21, where it is implied that many pagans had
a *theoretical* knowledge of God. It follows from this verse that
redemption took place through a *crucified Saviour* because human
wisdom was vain ; but it does not follow that the *fact* of re-
demption, as well as its mode, was due to the futility of worldly
wisdom. After man's Fall, redemption was necessary and super-
natural grace needed to be purchased for him ; but the mode of
redemption was determined from all eternity in view of the
foreseen blindness of human wisdom.

22-24. These verses prove or explain what has just been said,
namely, that God was pleased through the folly of the Gospel
to save them that believe. Verses 22, 23 show that the Gospel
was folly in the eyes of the world, v. 24 that it is the salvation
of believers. It was folly, because while, on the one hand, Jews

dicamus Christum crucifixum : Christ crucified, unto the Jews indeed a stumbling-block, and unto the gentiles, foolishness.
 Iudeis quidem scandalum, gentibus autem stultitiam :
 "Ipsis autem vocatis Iudaeis, "But unto them that are atque Graecis, Christum Dei called, both Jews and Greeks, virtutem, et Dei sapientiam : Christ the power of God and
 "Quia quod stultum est Dei, the wisdom of God. "For the

asked for and demanded signs, i.e., miracles such as they had hoped for from their Messiah (John vi. 30 : ii. 18 : Matt. xii. 38) ; and, on the other, Gentiles sought after wisdom—after some system of philosophy that would satisfy the mind and heart of man—the Apostles offered them only the Gospel of Christ crucified (or of a crucified Messiah), which was a stumbling-block to the Jews, inasmuch as they who had hoped for a victorious and conquering Messiah found in the suffering and death of Jesus Christ a strong objection against His claims to be the true Messiah ; and folly to the Gentiles, since as St. Thomas says : "Contra rationem humanae sapientiae videtur, quod Deus moriatur, et quod homo justus et sapiens se voluntarie turpissimae morti exponat." Yet this Gospel was salvation, since to those who were called, and who obeyed the call (*καλητός* in the New Testament always implies this), it was in reality what both Jew and Gentile looked for : God's power and God's wisdom. Thus these verses are quite naturally connected with v. 21 : God was pleased by the folly of the Gospel to save them that believe (21), seeing that (*ὅτι*) what Jew and Gentile look for, we do not offer them in the Gospel, but rather what seems to them folly or worse (22-23), yet what in reality is the salvation of believers (24).

"Greeks" is not to be referred to those of the Greek race (for the word never has this meaning in the New Testament) ; but, in contradistinction to the Jews, to those who had not received supernatural revelation, and here chiefly to the cultured portion of these.*

25. To confirm what has just been said about the efficacy of

* "Ελληνες, nunquam in N.T., est nomen gentiliū, quo gens seu natio Graecorum designetur ; sed plerumque est nomen religiosum, quo omnes illi, qui supernaturalē revelationem non acceperunt, designantur. hinc "Ελληνες tanquam gentiles frequentissime opponuntur Iudaeis (Acta xiv. 1 : xviii. 4 : ix. 10, etc.), et nomen "Ελληνες a seipso saepe vocatur gentiles (Joan. vii. 35. xii. 20 : Acta xvi. 1, 2, etc.). Neque Rom. 1. 14 ubi "Ελληνες πᾶσιθεν opponuntur, nomen est gentiliū, quia Apostolus Romanis scribens eos barbaris adnumerare non potuit, sed latiore sensu populos cultos designat in oppositione ad incultos" (Corr., p. 44. note).

sapientius est hominibus : et quod infirmum est Dei, fortius est hominibus.

²⁶ Videte enim vocationem vestram, fratres, quia non multi sapientes secundum carnem, non multi potentes non multi nobiles : ²⁷ Sed quae stulta sunt mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat sapientes : et in-

foolishness of God is wiser than men : and the weakness of God is stronger than men.

²⁶ For see your vocation, brethren, that *there are* not many wise according to the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble : ²⁷ But the foolish things of the world hath God chosen, that He may confound the wise : and the weak things

the Gospel of a crucified Saviour, the Apostle now adds : for that which appears to men to be the foolishness of God is wiser than men with all their wisdom, and that which appears to be the weakness of God, is stronger than men with all their strength. Τὸ μωρόν and τὸ ὀρθάν; are used for the corresponding substantives.*

26. God had shown His contempt for worldly wisdom not only by the preachers He chose and by the doctrine they should preach, but also by the sort of people whom He effectively called to the faith in Corinth. "For behold your calling" (the Greek might be rendered "ye behold," but the imperative sense is more probable). According to many, the abstract "calling" is put for the concrete, so that the Apostle would bid them look at, consider what sort of people had been called among them. If the abstract sense be retained, the Apostle directs attention to their conversion, in order that they may call to mind what sort of people were called : how that neither learning nor power nor noble birth was to be found in many of the converts. No doubt some of the earliest converts were people of position like Crispus and Erastus at Corinth (i. 14 ; Acts xviii. 8 ; Rom. xvi. 23) ; Dionysius the Areopagite at Athens (Acts xvii. 34), and the ladies at Thessalonica and Berea (Acts xvii. 4, 12), but the great majority were of the poorer class.

27. "The foolish things," here in contrast with τοὺς σοφοὺς means the unlearned and uneducated. The neuter gender heightens the paradox.† It is not merely meant that they were considered by the world to be foolish, for in the following clauses

* "Fit non raro ut *Adjectivum* in neutro genere singularis numeri positum adhibeatur ad modum *Substantivi* nominis *abstractae* significationis." Beelen, *Gramm. Graec.* N T., § 34. ¶ 130.

† "Neutrum genus nonnunquam adhibitum legitur ibi, ubi sermo quidem est *de persona*, sed omnino generaliter loqui maluit scriptor." Beel., *ibid.*, p. 178.

firma mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat fortia : ²⁸ Et ignobilia mundi, et contemptibilia elegit Deus, et ea quae non sunt, ut ea quae sunt destrueret : ²⁹ Ut non glorietur omnis caro in conspectu eius. ³⁰ Ex ipso autem vos estis in CHRISTO IESU, qui factus est nobis

of the world hath God chosen, that He may confound the strong : ²⁸ And the base things of the world, and the things that are contemptible hath God chosen, and things that are not, that He might bring to nought things that are : ²⁹ That no flesh should glory in His sight. ³⁰ But of Him are you in CHRIST JESUS, who of

they are spoken of as "weak," i.e., devoid of power, and "without noble birth," which they really were.

28. "Base," i.e., "those not of high family" (α and γίγνομαι)—For "that are contemptible," read rather "that are contemned."—"And the things that are not." The "and" (καί) is rejected by some critics. The evidence for and against it is fairly balanced, but slightly in its favour. If it be omitted, then this clause will stand in apposition, summing up what has been said. It does not matter much whether we take τὰ μὴ ὄντα to mean the things that are looked upon as of no account, as non-existent ; or, by hyperbole, the things that are non-existent. The ordinary force of μὴ is in favour of the former view,* but it is often used with the participle in the latter, or objective sense.—"That He might bring to nought," i.e., show to be of no worth, in the matter of salvation, those who are of great importance in their own estimation.

29. God's purpose in calling those who seemed not to have any shadow of claim and rejecting those who seemed to have, was that "no flesh" should glory in His sight. "Non omne pro nullo, et caro pro homine, idiotismi sunt Hebraici" (Est.). Instead of "in His sight," the true reading is "in God's sight." Since in the supernatural order we owe everything to God, we cannot glory before Him as if we wrought our own justification or had anything of ourselves (Cf. Rom. iii. 27 ; iv. 2).

30. "Et" standing at the beginning of this verse in some Latin texts must be a printer's error ; it is not represented in the original nor found in the best copies of the Vulgate.

"But of Him are you in Christ Jesus." The prominent position

* "Οὐ ἀδίδεται οὐδὲ ἀφίηται ὅταν ἀρνηθῇ ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ. ὅταν δὲ ἀρνηθῇ ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀδίδεται ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὡς ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ." Beza, *ibid.*, p. 488. But see J. H. Moulton, *Gramm. of New Test. Greek*, vol. i., pp. 170, 231, 232.

sapientia a Deo, et iustitia, et sanctificatio, et redemptio :
 21 Ut quemadmodum scriptum est : Qui gloriatur, in Domino gloriatur.

God is made unto us wisdom, and justice, and sanctification, and redemption : 21 That, as it is written, *He that glorieth, may glory in the Lord.*

at the beginning given to $\epsilon\kappa\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon$ brings out our dependence on God. "You" is emphatic, and $\delta\epsilon$ points the antithesis between Christians and the world generally. It matters little whether we take the sense to be : but in the supernatural order you are His handiwork ("of Him are you"), and this in Christ Jesus, i.e., through Christ's merits, and through incorporation with Him by faith, or : but of Him, you are Christians incorporated in the mystic body of Christ ("are you in Christ Jesus") ; in either case our dependence on God for justification through the merits of Christ is clearly set forth.

"Who of God is made." Better to render : "Who became wisdom for us from God" ($\delta\pi\acute{o}\varsigma$, i.e., sent by God). By metonymy Christ is said to have become wisdom for us, since He is the cause of our faith and spiritual wisdom. In $\eta\mu\acute{\iota}\nu$ we have a dative of advantage. It is clear that there cannot be question merely of imputative justice, for just as Christ is said to be the cause of our wisdom, which is really communicated to us through faith, so He is said to be the cause of our justice, which is therefore really communicated, and not merely imputed. Probably $\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota$ is used to connect very closely and present as one whole the negative and positive aspects of justification, the freedom from sin ("justice"), and the adornment with grace ("sanctification"). "Redemption" as being the root and foundation of all, is placed last for emphasis.

31. "That (it may come to pass) as it is written : He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord." Our Rheims translation "may glory" is incorrect. The Latin "gloriatur" is not a subjunctive, but an imperative ($\kappa\alpha\upsilon\chi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\theta\omega$). Something is understood ($\gamma\epsilon\upsilon\eta\tau\alpha\iota$ "fiat," "it may come to pass"), as we have indicated in brackets. The reference is to Jer. ix. 23, 24, the sense of which is given, but not the precise words. "Lord" refers in Jeremias to Jehovah, and in the LXX is rendered by $\delta\ \text{K}\acute{\upsilon}\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. From the sense of the original passage, then, as well as from the context here, "the Lord" is more probably to be referred to the Divinity than to Christ, and the meaning is, that we are not to refer any good work or salutary disposition to ourselves, as ultimately from ourselves, but to God, in whom we are to glory.

CHAPTER II

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

In conformity with the Divine plan, the Apostle's teaching at Corinth had been simple (ii. 1-5); but among mature Christians he and the other Apostles teach more abstruse doctrines, made known to them by the Holy Ghost, and imparted by them to their hearers in spiritual language (6-13); doctrines such as the natural man is incapable of receiving or passing judgment upon (14-16).

¹ *Et ego, cum venissem ad vos, fratres, veni non in sublimitate sermonis, aut sapientiae, annuntians vobis testimonium Christi. ² Non enim indicavi me scire aliquid inter*

¹ *AND I, brethren, when I came to you, came not in loftiness of speech or of wisdom; declaring unto you the testimony of Christ. ² For I judged not myself to know anything*

1. *Κόρυς.* "And I, accordingly," the *καὶ* pointing to the Apostle's observance at Corinth of the principles laid down in i. 17-31. In accordance with the Divine plan, he came to the Corinthians not in loftiness of either diction or doctrine. *Λόγος*, opposed here to *σοφία*, seems to refer to the *form* of his preaching as distinct from its matter. Some ancient authorities read "the mystery of God" instead of "the testimony of God." The Vulgate is alone in reading "the testimony of Christ." "The testimony of God," which is to be regarded as the true reading, is clearly the Gospel, which is so called either because it is God's testimony or witness to Christ, given through God's accredited ministers (iv. 1); or rather because it is a testimony to God and to His love for mankind as revealed in Christ (i. 8).

2. The sense is: "for I did not think fit to know anything among you except Jesus Christ, and Him (not raised to the throne of David, but) crucified." If we could connect *οὐ* with *τι εἰδέναι*, we should get the meaning: "for I decided not to know anything," etc., but the position of the negative makes such a view difficult. We must not take the statement here too strictly, for from this very Epistle we know that St. Paul instructed the Corinthians concerning the Blessed Eucharist, and the resurrection and appearances of Christ (xi. 23 ff.; xv. 3 ff.). The meaning is that the burden of his preaching had been of redemption through a crucified Saviour.

vos, nisi IESUM CHRISTUM, et hunc crucifixum. ² Et ego in infirmitate, et timore, et tremore multo fui apud vos : ⁴ Et sermo meus, et praedicatio mea, non in persuasibilibus humanae sapientiae verbis, sed in ostensione spiritus et virtutis : ⁵ Ut fides vestra non

among you, but JESUS CHRIST ; and Him crucified. ² And I was with you in weakness, and in fear, and in much trembling : ⁴ And my speech and my preaching was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom, but in shewing of the spirit and power : ⁵ That your faith might not stand on

3. " And I." The sense is that he himself by the manner of his presence among them, as well as in the matter of his preaching (v. 2), and its form (v. 4), was unimposing. Some take " weakness" of bodily infirmity (2 Cor. x. 10 ; xii. 10) ; others of timidity arising from the fact that he arrived alone in Corinth (Acts xvii. 15 ; xviii. 5) and from a sense of the greatness of the task before him (Acts xviii. 9) ; others, with great probability, of both. The phrase " in fear and trembling," or as here " much trembling," is used several times by St. Paul (2 Cor. vii. 15 ; Eph. vi. 5 ; Phil. ii. 12), and nowhere else in the New Testament. It probably means here fear of personal danger (Acts xviii. 8, 9) as well as a trembling anxiety to do worthily the work to which he was called (Eph. vi. 5).

4. As his doctrine (v. 2), and person (v. 3), were not calculated to appeal to the world, so his language, whether in private conversation or in public preaching, was not in the persuasive words of human wisdom. Πειθοῖς (" persuasive ") ; the adjective πειθός, which is found nowhere else, is the equivalent of the classical πειθνός, and is from πείθω, like φαῖδός from φαίδομαι. Ἀνθρωπίνης (" human ") is wanting in most authorities.

" But in showing of the spirit and power." Ἀπόδειξις, not used elsewhere in the New Testament, probably has here the meaning of " demonstration " or " strict proof," a meaning which it often has in classical Greek ; and this demonstration was wrought by the Holy Spirit and the miraculous power (δυνάμει) He gave to St. Paul. The Apostle does not indeed mean to claim that logical or scientific demonstration was always given, but he implies that such proof was given through the action of the Holy Ghost upon both preacher and hearers, that certainty as to religious truth was attained by believers.

5. The purpose of St. Paul (which of course was also the purpose of God, who moved the Apostle) in announcing the Gospel

sit in sapientia hominum sed in virtute Dei.

‘Sapientiam autem loquimur inter perfectos, sapientiam

the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.

‘Howbeit we speak wisdom among the perfect : yet not the

in such manner to the Corinthians, was that their faith might depend not on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.

It would be rash to infer from this passage that St. Paul always and everywhere preached in the same simple style as at Corinth. His poor success at Athens (xvii, 32-34) may have made him unusually subdued when he came on to Corinth ; at any rate, if we remark how he says in verse 1 : “ when I came to you ” . . . announcing to you ; in v. 2 : “ to know anything among you ” ; in v. 3 : “ I was with you,” we can have no doubt that it is chiefly, if not entirely, of his preaching at Corinth he is speaking.

6. But though among you I preached only the rudiments of the Christian faith in language devoid of the charms of human eloquence, yet among the perfect, that is, among those who are fit for solid food (iii. 2), “ who by custom have their senses exercised to the discerning of good and evil ” (Heb. v. 14), I and the other Apostles speak (ἀκούουσιν) high and deep truths of the Christian religion. In this view, which is the more probable, the Apostle distinguishes two kinds of teaching and two classes of Christian hearers ; one kind of teaching was rudimentary, dealing in a simple way with the necessary mysteries of religion, such as the incarnation, death, resurrection of Christ, and redemption through Him, and the moral obligations of Christians, and this was intended for those who, like the Corinthians, were not yet able for more solid food (iii. 2) ; another was more profound and abstruse, dealing with doctrines like the Priesthood of Christ (Heb. vii. i ff.), which is expressly mentioned among this class (Heb. v. 11), and with other profound mysteries of the Christian religion, and in a manner more subtle and more profound ; and this kind of teaching was directed to the “ perfect,” to those who were advanced in Christian knowledge and possessed of spiritual insight. There is no difficulty in supposing that the Apostles accommodated their preaching to the capacity of their hearers, and that while they preached the same faith of Christ to all, they yet did so in a very different manner on different occasions. On the Areopagus, amid the sages of Athens (Acts xvii. 22-32), Paul himself adopted a very different method from

vero non huius sæculi neque principum huius sæculi, qui destruuntur : ' Sed loquimur Dei sapientiam in mysterio, wisdom of this world, neither of the princes of this world, that come to nought : ' But we speak the wisdom of God in a

that employed by him on ordinary occasions, and in the catechism class the child is taught that God made the world, and that the Son of God, made man, redeemed it, but in a very different manner from that in which these truths are expounded to his class by a professor of Theology.

The view of St. Chrysostom and of the Greeks generally that the Apostle speaks here, not of the more profound doctrines, but of the ordinary Christian teaching, and of the ordinary faithful, as if he meant : Yet we do speak real wisdom among Christians, seems far less probable than that given above. For the Apostle contrasts his teaching among the " perfect " with his teaching at Corinth, not only here : " but we do speak wisdom among the perfect," but also in iii. 1-3, and the same contrast is clearly brought out in Heb. v. 11.

" Yet not the wisdom of this world (' age '), neither of the princes of this world (' age '), who come to nought." The wisdom of this " age " is the wisdom of the ante-Messianic period (cf. on i. 20), and since the wisdom of the princes of this " age " is distinguished from it, this can hardly mean anything but diabolical wisdom, by which is meant the superstitious and idolatrous doctrines introduced or fostered by the devils. The princes of this " age," then, are not kings and princes ; nor philosophers, princes of the realms of knowledge ; but as in other parts of Scripture the devils, who are so called because of the power they were allowed to exercise until the time of Christ over human nature and the creature destined for man's use. In John xii. 31 ; xiv. 30 ; xvi. 11, the devil is called by Christ Himself the prince of this world. See also Eph. ii. 2 ; vi. 12, and 2 Cor. iv. 4, in which last passage the devil is even called " the god of this age." The devils are said to come to nought, or rather to be " coming to nought," to be passing into nothingness, because by the spread of the Christian religion their power in the world was being curtailed and restrained (cf. John xii. 31 ; 1 John iii. 8 ; Heb. ii. 14). " Destruuntur ergo," says Estius, " quia potestas eorum destruitur."

7. " In a mystery." Estius understands this to mean : secretly, to a select audience. But the Apostle has already said this in

quae abscondita est, quam prae-
destinavit Deus ante saecula
in gloriam nostram, * Quam

mystery, a wisdom which is
hidden, which God ordained
before the world, unto our
glory : * Which none of the

the preceding verse in the words "among the perfect." It is best to take the words adjectivally, so that "the wisdom in a mystery" is the mysterious wisdom unattainable by natural means. Such adjectival clauses are not uncommon with St. Paul, and though they are usually preceded by the Greek article, yet not always (Cf. Rom. vi. 4 ; 1 Cor. x. 18, etc.).

"Which is hidden." In the Greek we have the perfect participle passive, "which hath been hidden" (as the Revised Version renders), signifying that it had been hidden during the past and still remains so,* except for those to whom God reveals it. And this wisdom hidden from the world was ordained by God before the world (Greek : "the ages"), that is, from eternity, unto the glory of St. Paul and his readers ; a glory tasted even in this world (2 Cor. iii. 18) and to be enjoyed fully in the world to come, when we shall see God face to face (xiii. 12).

8. "Which (wisdom) none of the princes of this world ('age') knew." The context naturally requires that we take "princes of this world" in the same sense as in verse 6, though St. Chrysostom and many others understood it in verse 6 of orators and philosophers, and here of Pilate, Herod and the Jewish priests and scribes. But we have seen that in verse 6 the wisdom of the world, or human wisdom, is distinguished from the wisdom of the princes of this world, so that the latter can only be the wisdom (or knowledge) of the devils. Hence in the present verse also we take it, with Estius and others, that the reference is to the devils. Nor is there any difficulty in holding that the devils were ignorant of the counsels of God, of the Divine purpose to redeem and save mankind through the death of the Son of God. It seems more probable, indeed, from the Gospels that the devils were not ignorant of Christ's Divinity. Whatever may be said regarding the devils' knowledge of Christ's Divinity at the time of the temptation of Christ (Matt. iv. 3 ; Luke iv. 3, 9), when our Lord had not yet begun His public mission, it seems clear that afterwards, during His public mission, the devils knew Him to be the Son of God. Thus in Matt. viii. 29 He is addressed by

* " Ea enim est vis participii perf. pass. ut actionem quidem praeteritam esse, affectum autem perdurare innuat " (Corn.).

nemo principum huius saeculi
cognovit : si enim cognovissent,
nunquam Dominum gloriae

princes of this world knew :
for if they had known it, they
would never have crucified the

the demoniacs as "Son of God," or according to the parallel passages : Mark v. 7 ; Luke viii. 28, "Son of the Most High God" ; in Mark i. 34 it is distinctly stated that Christ suffered not the demons (whom He had expelled) to speak, "*because they knew Him*,"* and in Mark i. 24 (Luke iv. 34) He is addressed by a demoniac as "the Holy one of God," and His power is taken for granted in the words : "Art Thou come to destroy us" ? If we add to this evidence from the Gospels, that the devils would have known of the fulfilment of prophecy in Christ, how He was conceived and born of a virgin, of the hymns of the angels which were heard by the shepherds (Luke i. 10-13), of the adoration of the Magi (Matt. ii. 11), of the testimony of the Father (Matt. iii. 17) that Christ was His Son (ὁ υἱὸς μου ὁ ἀγαπῆτός), of the testimonies of the Baptist (John i. 29 ff.), of Christ's sanctity and miracles and repeated claims to Divinity, there can hardly remain any doubt that the devils knew Him to be the Son of God, and that their testimonies to His Divine Sonship are to be understood in a strict sense.

But it was one thing to know Him to be the Son of God, another to know that His death was to bring glory to God and salvation to men. This counsel of God, this wisdom is what the devils did not know. "For if they had known it, they would never have crucified the Lord of glory."

Had the devils known the Divine purpose to glorify God, redeem man, and greatly reduce their own power, through Christ's death, they would never have instigated His enemies to put Christ to death, as they did instigate them (Luke xxii. 3, 53 ; John xiii. 2, 27). "Non ideo," says St. Thomas, "daemon Christum Judaeis crucifigere persuasit, quia Filium Dei non esse putavit, sed quia se morte illius non praevidit esse damnandum." Christ is called "the Lord of glory," not so much because as God He possesses glory from eternity, nor because as man He merited glory for Himself, but rather because He merited glory for, and bestows it upon, us. Compare ■ Thessa. iii. 16 : "Now the Lord of peace Himself give you everlasting peace."

* Many ancient authorities, however, read here as in L. iv. 41, because they knew Him to be *the Christ*, which, of course, would not necessarily imply knowledge of His Divinity.

crucifixissent. * Sed sicut scriptum est ; Quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit, quæ

Lord of glory. * But, as it is written : *That eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of man,*

9. To prove that this wisdom of God was hidden from men and devils, the Apostle now cites Scripture. The connection with verse 8 in this view is : which none of the princes of this world knew, but which, as the Scripture says, is hidden from all creatures. Others with less probability supply the words " we speak " (v. 7) in this verse. " But we speak the things which eye saw not," etc. ; while others again connect verse 9 with 10 : But as it is written : " what eye saw not . . . this God hath revealed to us." Neither connection, however, is so probable as that given above ; indeed, the latter is excluded by the adversative particle *Et* in the beginning of verse 10.

Verse 9 then proves verse 8 by a text taken from canonical Scripture (" as it is written ")—a text which shows that to God alone, and hence neither to devils nor men nor angels, had the Divine economy displayed in the salvation of men been known. The quotation was thought by some of the Fathers to be taken from a lost book of Scripture, because it is not found exactly in any book extant. But, with St. Jerome and commentators generally, we believe the reference is to *Isaias* lxiv. 4 (in Heb. text lxiv. 3), which in the present Hebrew runs thus : " And from of old they heard not, they perceived not by the ear, neither did eye see, O God, besides thee,* what (God) worketh (shall work) for him that waiteth for Him." And in the LXX : " From of old we heard not, neither did our eyes see a God besides thee, and thy works which thou wilt do for those that await mercy." There is nothing in the Hebrew of the text itself or its context to confine the ignorance in question to men only ; the indefinite " they heard not," etc., without any subject of the verbs being expressed, may well refer to all created beings.† We take it that St. Paul understood the text in this sense, and that by his words : " Things which (&) eye saw not, and ear heard not " he means to exclude all created intelligence from the knowledge in question, and so to give the substance of the Hebrew, " neither

* The Hebrew might also be rendered, as the LXX. and R.V. render : " hath not seen a God besides thee, who worketh for him who waiteth for Him." But see Knabenbauer on *Isaias*, p. 472 ff.

† The Revised Version is, therefore, not justified in rendering : " for from of old men have not heard," etc.

præparavit Deus iis qui diligunt illum : ¹⁰ Nobis autem revelavit Deus per Spiritum suum : Spiritus enim omnia scrutatur, etiam profunda Dei.

what things God hath prepared for them that love Him. ¹⁰ But to us God hath revealed *them*, by His spirit. For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the

did eye see, O God, besides thee," and that this is suggested by the fact that it is only in the next clause he mentions *man* : " nor hath it entered into the heart of man."

What, then, are these things that were unknown to all created beings before the Christian period ? Not merely the joys and glory of Heaven, but also the graces and blessings which God has prepared for us here on earth that we may attain to Heaven, and the means too, namely, the passion and death of Christ, whereby He prepared them. St. Peter says that the angels desire to look into the mysteries of the Gospel (1 Pet. i. 12), and St. Paul himself speaks of the manifold wisdom of God being made known through the Church to the principalities and the powers in the heavenly places (Eph. iii. 10) ; so that even the angels, as well as the devils and mankind, were ignorant of the Divine economy of redemption, unless in so far as God may have revealed something to some particular angel or prophet.

When St. Paul says that God has prepared all the graces in question " for them that love Him," the meaning may simply be that He has prepared them for Christians. But if we understand the love of man for God to be given as the reason why God prepared grace and glory, then first grace, which is altogether gratuitous (Eph. ii. 4, 5, 8, 9, etc.), cannot be included, and the reference must be to the wealth of additional graces and the bestowal of eternal glory, which indeed are the reward of charity and good works.

10. He here anticipates an objection. It might be asked : If no man knows this wisdom, how then do you and the other Christian teachers preach it ? And he replies that God had revealed it to them. The position of *αὐτοῖς* makes it emphatic. Instead of the *ὅτι* that follows, some ancient authorities read *γάρ*, but the evidence is in favour of *ὅτι*.—" For the Spirit searcheth all things, yea the deep things of God." " Searcheth " not as seeking for knowledge that He lacks, but as penetrating fully into even the mysteries of God. In the same way God is said to search the heart of man (Rom. viii. 27 ; Ps. vii. 10 ; Jer. xvii. 10, etc.).

¹¹ Quis enim hominum scit quae sunt hominis, nisi spiritus hominis qui in ipso est ! ita et quae Dei sunt, nemo cognovit, nisi Spiritus Dei. ¹² Nos autem non spiritum huius mundi accepi-mus, sed Spiritum qui ex Deo

deep things of God. ¹¹ For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him ! So the things also that are of God no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God. ¹² Now we have received not the spirit of this world, but the Spirit that is

11. By an illustration the Apostle shows that the Holy Spirit, and He only, knows even the mysteries of God, and therefore could reveal them to the Apostles. "For what man," etc. ! As only the spirit, that is, the soul or mind of man, which is substantially united with Him, knows the thoughts and intentions of man, so only the Holy Spirit of God, which is substantially united with Him, knows the counsels of God. "Of course, the Son of God is no more excluded here than is the Holy Ghost, where it is said : "No one knows the Father but the Son" (Matt. xi. 27 ; Luke x. 22), because when there is question of the essential attributes of the Godhead, only those are excluded who have a different nature" (MacEv.).

Nor can any objection to the distinct personality of the Holy Ghost be drawn from this verse. It is true, indeed, that the spirit of man is not a person, but it is a well-known maxim that comparisons must not be pressed beyond the point intended, else in calling John a lion we might be thought to rank him among quadrupeds. Here the point of the comparison is suggested by the Apostle in the words "that is in him" ; both spirits are substantially united to the substance to which they belong, and therefore acquainted with its secrets ; but whether they are alike in the *mode* of their subsistence, and both impersonal, is not said. Rather the whole context, and especially verse 10, where the Spirit is said to have revealed wisdom to the Apostles, implies that the Spirit of God is a distinct Person.

12. "The spirit of this world" (rather "of the world," for τοῦτου is commonly rejected by critics) is held by very many to be the wisdom of the world, but since in the words that follow, a personal Spirit, the Holy Ghost, seems to be meant, it is better, with Calmet, Cornely, etc., to understand the spirit of the world to be the devil, who is the author of false human wisdom, "the spirit that now exerts his power on the children of unbelief" (Eph. ii. 2), for without necessity we ought not to understand an

est, ut sciamus quae a Deo donata sunt nobis: ¹² Quae et loquimur non in doctis humanae sapientiae verbis, sed in doctrina Spiritus, spiritualibus spiritualia comparantes. ¹⁴ Animalis autem homo non

of God: that we may know the things that are given us from God. ¹² Which things also we speak, not in the learned words of human wisdom; but in the doctrine of the Spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. ¹⁴ But the sensual man per-

impersonal spirit in one case and a Personal One in the other. We (the Apostles) received the Spirit that is of God, he says, that we might know the things that were bestowed (χαρισθέντα) upon us by God, that is, that we might know "the things that pertain to salvation: how Christ died for us, made us sons of God, and set us at the right hand of the Father in Himself" (Theoph.).

13. "Not in the learned words of human wisdom but in the doctrine of the Spirit." A better rendering would be: "not in words taught by human wisdom but in words taught by the Spirit." *

"Comparing spiritual things with spiritual." The Revised Version in its text agrees with the Rheims in this rendering, though in the margin it gives two alternatives: "combining spiritual things with spiritual" and "interpreting spiritual things to spiritual men." The ambiguity of the phrase arises from the fact that συγκρίνειν has various senses: usually "to compare," sometimes "to combine," and sometimes in the LXX "to interpret" or "explain"; also from the fact that πνευματικοίς may be either masculine or neuter. Hence there are various interpretations. (a) Some thus: *Comparing* the mysteries of the New Testament with those of the Old Testament, and thus illustrating them from their ancient types. So St. Chrysostom and the Greeks generally. (b) Others thus: *Explaining* spiritual things to spiritual men. (c) Others thus: *Explaining* spiritual things in spiritual language. (d) Others again thus: *Combining* (adapting) spiritual language with (to) spiritual subjects. Either (c) or (d) gives substantially what we believe is the true sense, and there is no need to delay in choosing between them.

14. "But the sensual man (ψυχικός) perceiveth not" (rather "receiveth not"), etc. Many have held that by the ψυχικός is

* "Ad Genetivos dependentiae pertinent quoque Genetivi qui junguntur Adjectivis verbalibus aut Participiis derivatis a Verbis quae cum alio quam Genetivo casu construi solent, e.g., 1 Cor. ii. 13." Beel, *ibid.*, p. 195.

percipit ea quæ sunt Spiritus Dei : stultitia enim est illi, et non potest intelligere : quia ceiveth not these things that are of the Spirit of God : for it is foolishness to him, and he cannot understand : because it

meant the imperfect Christian who has the faith, the same who is afterwards in iii. 1, 3 spoken of as carnal. But we find it hard to accept this view, and for the following reasons : (1) St. Paul uses a different word (*σωφρονός* or *σώφρωνος*) in iii. 1, 3 to designate imperfect Christians. (2) He could hardly say that the higher wisdom was *folly* to the imperfect Christian ; such strong language makes it more probable that he is speaking here of unbelievers. (3) He would scarcely say that the imperfect Christian does not receive and cannot understand the higher wisdom, however true it might be that he would generally fail to understand. (4) It is natural to expect that the Apostle would refer here to unbelievers. He is showing why he had not preached the higher wisdom at Corinth, and he gives as a reason that the pagan or merely " natural " man would regard it only as folly, while the imperfect Corinthian Christians on their conversion were unable to bear it (iii. 1, 3). We hold then with Beel., Steenk., Corn., etc., against St. Thom., Est. Lap., etc., that in the passage ii. 14—iii. 3, the Apostle distinguishes three classes of men—(a) the spiritual man, (b) as farthest removed from him, and in the lowest place, the merely natural man (*ψυχικός*), and (c) the imperfect Christian.

The *spiritual* man (*πνευματικός*) is the man who is guided by his mind, or superior part, that superior part itself being under the influence and guidance of the Holy Spirit. *Πνεύμα* (from which comes *πνευματικός*) is often used by St. Paul of man's superior part, considered as directed by the Holy Spirit of God, e.g., Rom. viii. 9 ; Gal. v. 17, 22 ; in the last verse the Christian virtues are spoken of as " the fruit of the spirit," that is, of the same spirit of man (but, of course, under the influence of the Holy Spirit), of which there is question in verse 17 (cf. Corn.).

The *natural* man (*ψυχικός*), is he who, not having faith or sanctifying grace, is guided merely by his natural reason, and judges of the truths put before him on the principles of natural reason alone.

The *carnal* man (*σώφρωνος* or *σώφρονός*) referred to in iii. 1, 3 is the Christian who indeed has the faith and may even be in the state of grace—for the Apostle in iii. 1 speaks of such as

spiritualiter examinatur. is spiritually examined. ¹⁵ But
¹⁵ Spiritualis autem iudicat omnia : et ipse a nemine iudicatur. the spiritual man judgeth all
 things : and he himself is judged

"little ones in Christ"—but who is still imperfect, and in whom the weakness of human nature ("the flesh") still manifests itself, as it did in the Corinthian Christians through their factions and dissensions.

The natural man, then, does not receive (οὐ δέχεται) the higher wisdom, the things that are of the Spirit of God. "For they are (not : 'it is') foolishness to him."* Not being possessed of the supernatural principles, in the light of which he should examine such truths, he regards them merely as foolishness.

"And he cannot understand" (Greek "know"), i.e., even if he did not reject them at once but tried to know and understand them, he could not ; it is not possible for him, and the reason follows : because they are to be spiritually judged of.

15. But what the natural man does not receive and is incapable of understanding, the spiritual man, whose intellect is illumined and will inflamed by the Holy Ghost, receives and appreciates. He may not, indeed, understand all the higher wisdom, but in the light of supernatural principles he will decide to accept even where he does not understand, and in this sense will judge of, approve of, even the highest mysteries that may be brought under his notice ; "all things" meaning the things of the higher wisdom as well as those sensible and earthly things of which the natural man could judge.†

"And he himself is judged of no man." The meaning, of course, is that he can be judged by no man except a spiritual man. This exception is warranted by the first part of the verse, for if the spiritual man can judge of all things, he can judge of another spiritual man and estimate him according to his true worth.

The Calvinists and Anabaptists used to appeal to this text in favour of interpreting the Scriptures according to the private Spirit given to each individual. But the whole context makes it clear that St. Paul is speaking of the man who can *appreciate* the doctrine put before him by an authorised teacher, not of one who may accept or reject that doctrine or the sense of the Bible,

* According to the common Greek usage the neuter plural has its verb in the singular. The Vulgate ought to read : "stultitia enim sunt illi . . . quia spiritualiter examinatur."

† *Novus* might be acc. sing. masc. as far as regards form.

¹⁵ Quis enim cognovit sensum Domini, qui instruat eum ? Nos autem sensum Christi habemus.

of no man. ¹⁶ For who hath known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him ? But we have the mind of Christ.

according to the whims of his fancied private spirit. The same Apostle who tells us that Christ "gave some Apostles . . . and some pastors and teachers" (Eph. iv. 11) cannot mean that each private individual is to be his own teacher.

Neither does this text mean that the spiritual man is irresponsible except to God. The meaning is that he cannot be judged except by a spiritual man (or by the Church which has the Spirit of God, and is in the highest sense spiritual).

16. He now shows that the man who is not spiritual cannot judge of the man who is.

The verse contains the major and minor of a syllogism, the conclusion of which, as often with St. Paul, he does not think it necessary to express, leaving it to be understood from the context. The major is contained in the words quoted freely from Isaiah xl. 13. The prophet, having in the context promised the Jewish people deliverance from captivity, appeals to the power and wisdom of God in order to give them hope and confidence. The Hebrew of the passage means : " Who hath directed the spirit of the Lord, or being His counsellor hath taught Him ? " and the LXX : " Who knew the mind of the Lord, and who was His counsellor, to instruct Him ? " St. Paul gives the sense of the passage, and the meaning is : So great is the wisdom of the Lord (πῶς) that no one is able to instruct Him. To this the Apostle adds a minor proposition : " But we have the mind of Christ," and the conclusion, as the context proves, is : Therefore no one who is not spiritual can instruct or pass judgment upon us. But note that in order that the argument may conclude, the " mind of Christ " must be the mind of God, and we have a clear argument here for the Divinity of Christ.

CHAPTER III

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Apostle could not have preached this higher wisdom at Corinth during his eighteen months' stay there, because the Corinthian Christians were then but "babes in Christ" (vv. 1, 2); nay, even still they are unfit to receive it, as is evidenced by their factions (3-4). These factions are absurd, inasmuch as all the teachers regarding whom the Corinthian Christians were contending, are servants of the same Lord (5-9). God shall one day judge the labours of all these teachers, let them therefore take care how they labour (10-17). Practical admonitions to both the teachers and the faithful (18-23).

¹ Et ego, fratres, non potui ¹ AND I, brethren, could not
vobis loqui quasi spiritualibus, speak to you as unto spiritual,
sed quasi carnalibus. Tanquam but as unto carnal. As unto

1. The Apostle has stated that he and the other Christian teachers spoke wisdom, or higher and more profound doctrines of the Christian faith among the perfect (ii. 6 ff.). Then, proceeding to show why he had not preached it at Corinth during his eighteen months' stay there, he indicated that there was no use in preaching it to the natural man, or heathen (ii. 14), because such a one would have rejected it. And now in this verse he says that even to the Corinthian converts he could not have preached this wisdom, because they were unfit to receive it. As he has to say unpleasant things, he begins with the endearing term, "brethren."

The sense of the verse is that he could not profitably have spoken the higher wisdom to them, because they were carnal.* The *ὡς*, "quasi" (rather: "tanquam") expresses not similitude but identity, as in John i. 14 (the glory *as* of the only begotten). We may bring out the sense by rendering: I could not speak to you *as being* spiritual, but *as being* carnal. For the sense of carnal, see above on ii. 14.

* In this verse the evidence is in favour of *σπῳσις* as against *σπῳισμός*, though in v. 3 *σπῳισμός* is to be read in both instances, not *σπῳισμός*. "Sensus non mutatur, sive prior sive altera lectio praeferatur: eodem enim modo PP. Graeci omnes locum interpretati sunt, licet alii priorem, alii alteram lectionem secuti sint" (Corn.).

parvulis in Christo, ¹ Lac vobis potum dedi, non escam : non-dum enim poteratis : sed nec nunc quidem potestis : adhuc enim carnales estis. ² Cum enim sit inter vos zelus, et contentio : nonne carnales estis, et secundum hominemambu-

little ones in Christ. ¹ I gave you milk to drink, not meat : for you were not able as yet. But neither indeed are you now able ; for you are yet carnal. ² For whereas there is among you envying and contention, are you not carnal, and walk

The Apostle tones down the severity of the expression " carnal " by adding, " as being little ones in Christ." They were young and inexperienced in the Christian faith, and the higher wisdom would have only puzzled without profiting them (Cf. Heb. v. 11-16).

2. The Vulgate connects the last clause of verse 1 with verse 2, a sense which the Greek would bear, if *νηριους* were the correct reading, for this accus. could then be taken in apposition to *ὁυτος* of verse 2. But since *νηριος*, not *νηριους*, is the more probable reading, it would be better if the Vulgate had a comma after " carnalibus " and a period after " Christo."—" I gave you milk to drink, not meat." In the Greek there is zeugma in the word *ἐπιτρένω* which could not properly be used of giving solid food.

Continuing the metaphor wherein he has called them babes, he now says that when he was among them he treated them as babes, keeping back from them the solid food of the higher wisdom for which only the perfect, or full-grown are fit (Heb. v. 14). From Heb. vi. 1, 2 we get some idea of what was the milk, or elementary doctrine which he preached to them. It touched upon the nature and necessity of repentance and faith in God, on the doctrine of Baptism and Confirmation, on the resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment. What precisely the higher wisdom was which the Apostle kept back we cannot say with certainty. Doubtless, among other things, the mysteries of grace and predestination.

3. In v. 2 he said that even still, about five years after he first preached to them, they are unable to bear the higher wisdom. He now appeals to the envy (or jealousy) and strife among them to prove that this is so.

Some ancient authorities read " envy and strife and factions," but the words : " and factions " are generally rejected by critics as a gloss.

" And walk according to man ? " that is, after the manner and desires of human nature uninfluenced by grace.

latis ? ' Cum enim quis dicat : Ego quidem sum Pauli ; alius autem : Ego Apollo : nonne homines estis ? Quid igitur est Apollo ? quid vero Paulus ?

' Ministri eius cui credidistis, et unicuique sicut Dominus dedit. ' Ego plantavi, Apollo rigavit : sed Deus incrementum

according to man ? ' For while one saith, I indeed am of Paul ; and another, I am of Apollo ; are you not men ? What then is Apollo, and what is Paul ?

' The ministers of him whom you have believed : and to every one as the Lord hath given. ' I have planted, Apollo watered, but God gave the

4. The Apostle now specifies the jealousy and strife to which he has referred. For "Ego Apollo" of the Vulgate, read in English : "I of Apollos."

"Are you not men ?" οὐκ ἀνθρώποι ἐστε ; This is the true reading. The reading : "are you not carnal" (σάρκικοι) ? has very slight authority to support it, and was doubtless introduced by some scribe who thought the expression : "are you not men ?" peculiar, as indeed it is, and unique in the Pauline writings in this sense. The meaning is : are you not men acting after the manner of human nature when uninfluenced by grace ?

What (τί, not τίς) then is Apollos ? This and the following clause might more properly stand in the next verse. The Apostle now brings forward a new argument against dissension and faction, drawn from the relations of the Corinthian teachers to God and to each other.

5. First in their relation to God they are all alike His servants, and the peculiar part of each in that service has been allotted to him by Christ ("and to everyone as the Lord hath given"), so that neither in the character of servant, which they all alike possess, nor because of the particular part they play in the work of their Master, since that is assigned to them by Him, can either the teachers or their disciples find anything to glory or anything to make one be preferred to another. Instead of : "ministers of him whom you (have) believed," which is in accordance with the Vulgate, all the other ancient versions, and the Greek MSS. and FF. have : "ministers *through whom* (δι' ὧν, through whose instrumentality) you believed." Διάκονοι is used in its primary sense of "servants," not deacons.

6. He exemplifies what he meant by saying : "and to everyone as the Lord hath given." God has assigned to different teachers different parts in the work ; for instance, I planted, etc. In this metaphorical language the Christians of Corinth are spoken of

dedit. ⁷ Itaque neque qui plantat est aliquid, neque qui rigat : sed, qui incrementum dat, Deus. ⁸ Qui autem plantat, et qui rigat, unum sunt. Unus-

increase. ⁷ Therefore neither he that planted is anything, nor he that watereth ; but God that giveth the increase. ⁸ Now he that planteth, and he that watereth, are one. And every

as a field in which the seeds of faith were sown by Paul himself, then Apollos came and watered the plants, or confirmed the faith which Paul had planted ; but when both had done all they could, it was not they but God who gave the growth (*ηύξανε* literally, was giving—all along—the increase) " Quod autem sequitur : sed Deus incrementum dedit," says St. Augustine, " non per illos, sed per se ipsum facit : excedit hoc humanam humilitatem, excedit angelicam sublimitatem, nec omnino pertinet nisi ad agricolam Trinitatem." (In Joann. tr. 80, 2).

7. From what he has said in verses 5 and 6 the Apostle draws two conclusions, one here, the other in the next verse. Here he concludes that when compared with God, who gives the growth, the preachers are of no account. " Dicuntur autem plantans et rigans . . . nihil esse, hoc sensu : quia licet foris exhibeant suum ministerium, non tamen actione sua interiorem attingunt effectum vel vegetationis in naturalibus, vel sanctificationis in divinis. Sed illam quidem efficit natura Deo autore, istam vero sibi soli Deus reservat " (Est.).

8. The Apostle has concluded that, compared with God, the different teachers are of no account, and therefore should not be the occasion of dissension : while if compared with each other, he now adds, they are really the same, all being but servants ; servants, too, of the same master, engaged in the same work, and labouring for the same end.

" But (54) every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour." But if there is any disparity in them, as there may be, because one has worked harder than another, even that it is not for you to judge, but for God, " who shall render to each man according to his works " (Rom. ii. 6). Note that it is not according to the particular office he holds, nor according to the success which attends his efforts, but according to his own (*ἵδιον*) labour that each shall receive his own (*ἵδιον*) reward. " Itaque," says à Lapide, " integrum laboris præmium essentiale habebis ex concione vel instructione tua, licet nullus sequatur fructus, nullus hæreticus vel peccator convertatur ; imo sæpe

quisque autem propriam mercedem accipiet secundum suum laborem. * Dei enim sumus adiutores : Dei agricultura estis, Dei aedificatio estis.

man shall receive his own reward according to his own labour. * For we are God's coadjutors : you are God's husbandry, you are God's building.

majus, quia difficilius est et magis arduum concionari, ubi nullus vel exiguus apparet fructus, quam ubi concioni multi applaudunt vel ex concione proficiunt."

We have here a proof that good works merit before God, as the Council of Trent, Sess. 6, *De Justif.* Can. 32 defined. This follows from the fact that there is question in the text of *reward* (μισθός = wages for work done), and of a reward in apportioning which the works are taken into account. It is true it may not be distinctly said here that the reward is *on account of* (propter) the works, though according to the usage of human language it is at least implied. Protestants admit that the reward is given in view of, or with attention on the part of God to, the works, but not on account of them, but on account of God's pure mercy. But the same Apostle who wrote this, makes his meaning clear in 2 Cor. iv. 17, where he declares good works to be the *cause* of our eternal glory. "For that which is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, *worketh* for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory." See also Matt. xii. 37 ; Matt. xxv. 34-36, as compared with 41-43 of the same chapter, Gal. vi. 9, etc.

9. "For we are God's coadjutors." Some think this statement proves the first statement of verse 8, that he who planteth and he who watereth *are one*, the second statement of verse 8 being then regarded as parenthetical ; while others hold it proves both statements. But the first statement of verse 8 follows from verse 5, and hence we take the clause before us to be connected with the second statement of verse 8, as pointing out who shall give the reward in question. God will take account of whatever real difference there is in His ministers, and hence even on this score the Corinthians ought to abstain from judging them. For "coadjutors" the original has *συνεργοί*, "fellow-workers," i.e., fellow-workers with God, rather than fellow-workers with each other and employed by God.* The Vulgate "adiutores" is, of course, not to be understood as if His ministers could add any-

* "In omnibus locis in quibus *συνεργός* cum genit. conjungitur genitivus indicat illum quocum aliquis operatur. Rom. xvi. 3 ; ix. 21, etc." (Corn.).

¹⁰ Secundum gratiam Dei, quae data est mihi, ut sapiens architectus fundamentum posui : alius autem supersaedificat. Unusquisque autem videat quomodo supersaedificet. ¹¹ Fundamentum enim aliud nemo potest ponere, praeter id quod

¹⁰ According to the grace of God, that is given to me, as a wise architect, I have laid the foundation : and another buildeth thereon. But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon. ¹¹ For other foundation no man can lay, but that which is laid ; which is Jesus

thing to God's power, but simply in the sense that they are His ministers, whom He honours by working through and with them.

"You are God's husbandry." Since husbandry means the *business* of a farmer, or farming, it would be better to render "God's tilled land." (See Schleus., *Lex. Gr.—Lat. in N. T.*, and Grimm). The Vulgate is misleading, and would be better rendered "Dei ager cultus (estis), Dei aedificium estis." Rob. Plumm., however, support the Vulgate, and understand that the Corinthians exhibit God's *operations* in spiritual husbandry and spiritual architecture.

10. In another metaphor for which he prepared the way in the closing words of verse 9, the Apostle sets forth the different parts played by the Corinthian teachers, and then goes on to admonish those who were still engaged in the work. In calling himself "a wise (i.e., skilled) master-builder," the Apostle's intention is not to praise himself, for in the words immediately preceding he attributes all to the grace of God, but to vouch for the solidity of the foundation which he laid, that is, for the solidity of the elementary doctrine which he preached. "But let every man take heed how he buildeth thereupon." The "how" might refer not only to the materials employed, but to the zeal, attention, etc., of the builders ; but the context (v. 12) shows that it is chiefly, if not exclusively, of the materials the Apostle is thinking.

11. He explains that it is only of (the manner of) building upon the foundation that he speaks, because another foundation no one can (consistently with what is right) lay. *Ποτὲ* means "contrary to," as in Gal. i. 8, rather than "besides," though either meaning would give a true sense here. The foundation laid by St. Paul was "Jesus Christ," that is, faith in the Divinity of Christ and in redemption through Him. Anyone attempting to alter this foundation would not be a Christian teacher but a heretic (Gal. i. 6, 7).

positum est, quod est CHRISTUS CHRIST. ¹² Now if any man
 IESUS. ¹² Si quis autem super- build upon this foundation,
 aedificat super fundamentum gold, silver, precious stones,

12. Proceeding to warn the various builders, he declares that the work of each shall one day be put to the test. St. Chrysostom and many of the Greeks take the builders to be the faithful generally, and by the precious and vile materials mentioned in this verse they understand respectively the good or *mortally sinful* actions of the faithful. But the context, where St. Paul as builder or teacher compares himself with other teachers (cf. v. 6), and where the Corinthians are spoken of as the building (9), shows that the other builders are not the Corinthian faithful generally, but their teachers. Besides, as we shall show in verse 15, St. Chrysostom is forced to give a wholly unnatural and inadmissible meaning to the words, "but he himself shall be saved." St. Augustine, too, and St. Gregory the Great understood the reference to be to the faithful generally, the former understanding the precious materials of this verse to refer to good works of supererogation, the vile materials to imperfections; while the latter, understanding the precious materials like St. Augustine, took the vile materials to be venial sins. We need not delay upon these various views for the reason already given, namely, that the context seems to us to prove that there is question not of the faithful of Corinth generally but of their teachers.

Now, it is plain from the verse that two classes of doctrines are contemplated, and indeed the vile materials mentioned are so vile, that if we had not sufficient reason for judging otherwise, we might conclude that heretical doctrines are meant. But we must bear in mind that all the builders are supposed to be building on the true and one foundation, therefore heresy is out of the question; moreover, in verse 15 it is said that even the builders of the vile materials shall be saved; therefore again there can be no question of doctrines that were heretical. Some teachers, therefore, must be aimed at, who though sound in the faith, were mixing up frivolous or silly teachings with the sound words of the Gospel. What precisely they taught we cannot say with certainty. Possibly they were dilating on Jewish prerogatives; which indeed could not be denied (Rom. iii. 1, 2; ix. 3-5), but the urging of which was only calculated to do harm in Corinth. We know that when the Apostle wrote his next letter to the

hoc, aurum, argentum, lapides wood, hay, stubble : ¹² Every
pretiosos, ligna, foenum, stipu- man's work shall be manifest :
lam, ¹³ Uniuscuiusque opus for the day of the Lord shall

Corinthians, about six months or so after the present one, there were teachers among them who were boasting of the prerogatives of the Jews and were even trying to undermine the authority of St. Paul (2 Cor. xi. 21 ff.).

Two classes of doctrine then are indicated, one in every way good, typified by the "gold, silver, and precious stones"; the other frivolous or inopportune, typified by the wood, hay, stubble.

13. "Every man's work shall be made manifest." Here we have the apodosis of the sentence, of which verse 12 is the protasis: If any man build upon this foundation gold, etc., the quality of each one's work shall be made manifest.—"For the day of the Lord shall declare it." The correct reading is: "For the day shall declare" (it) (ἡ γὰρ ἡμετέρα θηλώσει). The character of the work shall be manifested, therefore, on a certain day. But what day is meant? Some understand of the day of tribulation, but this cannot be the meaning for the tribulations and sorrows of this life do not manifest to a man himself, much less to the world, the character of his works and teaching. For since tribulations often fall to the lot of the good in this world, and "man knoweth not whether he be worthy of love or hatred; but all things are kept uncertain for the time to come, because all things equally happen to the just and to the wicked" (Eccles. ix. 1, 2), hence the time of tribulation does not make manifest the quality of a man's works.

Others understand of the day of particular judgment, but it is not in the usage of Scripture to speak of that as "the day," nor will that day make manifest except to the person judged the character of his works. Besides, "the day" or "the day of the Lord" is commonly throughout Scripture used in reference to the day of general judgment, and it is to this day alone that the words of our text can be properly applied. It alone shall make manifest (to all) the works of all (iv. 5), and it alone shall be revealed in fire (1 Thess. i. 8; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 10). Cf. iv. 3-5.

"Because it shall be revealed (ἀποκαλύπτεται) in fire." It is not the work of each one that shall be revealed in fire, for that is implied in the next statement, but *the day* shall be revealed in fire. "Sicut enim dies noster quotidianus illucescere dicitur

manifestum erit : dies enim declare it, because it shall be Domini declarabit, quia in igne revealed in fire : and the fire revelabitur : et uniuscuiusque shall try every man's work, of

ob solis exortum : ita convenienter intelligi potest a Paulo significatum, quod ille dies omnibus illucescet ignis exortu. Nam et sunt, qui sic vertant : *quia cum igne illucescet.*" (Est.). Nor is the present tense of the original (ἀποκαλύπτεται) against this view, for the present is often used for the future to indicate confidence or certainty that the thing in question shall come to pass (see Greek of Matt. xxvi. 2, etc.). Another possible view of this clause is to take the verb impersonally : " for there shall be a revealing in fire " ; but it does not appear so probable as the preceding.

The fire in which the day shall be revealed we understand of the fire of conflagration at the end of the world (2 Thess. i. 8 ; 2 Pet. iii. 7, 10). Those who understand " the day " of the time of tribulation or of the time of particular judgment, are forced to take fire here metaphorically in reference to the searching judgment of God. But since, as we have seen, " the day " is most probably the day of general judgment, so the fire is most probably the fire of conflagration, which shall consume this world. Since the world is to be destroyed by fire (2 Pet. iii. 7, etc.), and since the Apostle is most probably speaking of the general judgment and the end of the world, it is natural to think that he is referring to real fire.

" And the fire shall try every man's work, of what sort it is." Many critics read αὐτό here after πῦρ : τὸ πῦρ αὐτό δοκιμάσει, but as some of the oldest Greek MSS. (Æ D E L), many FF., and all the VV. are against it, it is more probably not genuine. If read, it might refer to " fire " : the fire itself shall try each man's work ; or to " work " : every man's work of what sort it is, the fire shall try it.

The meaning of the present statement is that the fire of conflagration shall test the quality of each man's work. All, both good and bad, shall have to pass through that fire ; those who have nothing to expiate shall pass wholly unscathed, as did the three youths of old in the fiery furnace (Dan. iii. 50, 94) ; those just who have anything to atone for, shall be purified in passing through it ; while those in mortal sin shall find in it the beginning of their eternal torture. See Estius, who shows that this view of the different effects of the fire of conflagration on different classes of people was held by many of the Fathers.

opus quale sit, ignis probabit. what sort it is. ¹⁴ If any man's work abide, which he hath built thereupon: he shall receive a reward. ¹⁵ If any

¹⁴ Si cuius opus manserit quod superædificavit, mercedem accipiet. ¹⁵ Si cuius opus arserit,

14. The Apostle goes on to show how the fire shall try every man's work. If any man's work shall abide (*uvetl*, the fut. is probably right) which he built upon the foundation, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss.

The man whose work shall remain as it were quite untouched by that fire shall receive a reward, that is, a special reward destined for good teachers (the doctor's *aureola*). That there is not question of the essential reward of all the blessed is proved by the fact that even those whose works shall not stand the test, shall be saved (verse 15), and so receive the essential reward. Here again we have mention of reward (*μισθός*) given by God, and therefore man's merits are supposed. Cf. what has been said above on verse 8.

15. If, on the other hand, any man's work shall be burned he shall suffer loss. The Greek word rendered "he shall suffer loss" might mean "he shall be fined," or "he shall be punished," but perhaps the most natural sense here is that he shall lose the special reward given to those whose teachings shall stand the test.

"But he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." He shall lose the special reward, but shall be saved himself. St. Chrysostom who, as we have seen, understands the wood, hay and stubble to signify mortal sins, takes the meaning here to be that he who has committed mortal sin shall be kept living and unconsumed, "saved" for punishment, in the fire of hell. But this is a most unnatural meaning to give to the word *σωθήσεται*, and the Latin theologians in the Council of Florence rightly asserted against the Greeks "vocem salutis erit (*σωθήσεται*) in tota Scriptura salutem, auxilium, liberationem a malo, refrigerium et similia denotare, nusquam vero malum aliquod" (Mansi, *Coll. Conc.* 31, 489). And besides the meaning of the word in general, its sense here is determined by the antithesis (but he himself, *αὐτός δὲ*) between the loss of the reward and the teacher's own salvation—he shall lose the special reward, but he himself shall be saved.

"Yet so as by (or through) fire" (*οὕτως δὲ ὥς διὰ πυρός*). The sense may be that he shall be saved, yet only by passing through

detrimentum patietur: ipse man's work burn, he shall
 suffer loss: but he himself shall
 autem salvus erit, sic tamen be saved, yet so as by fire.

the fire of conflagration; *ὥς* need not deny the reality of the fire here any more than it denies the only-begottenness of Christ, in John i. 14, or the carnality of the Corinthians in the first verse of this chapter. But even if we give *ὥς* its more usual comparative meaning we can understand the present clause to mean that the imperfect teacher shall be saved at the last day only after passing through the fire of conflagration *just as* (*ὥς*) a man escaping from a burning house is saved only with difficulty after he has suffered in passing through the fire. Or again, since *πυρρός* is without the article, perhaps the expression "yet so as by fire" is proverbial, meaning that such teacher shall be saved with difficulty, and only after he has suffered.

Thus the sense of verses 13-15 is that good teachers who teach sound doctrine in a proper way, shall go unpunished and receive a special reward on the last day; while imperfect teachers shall lose the special reward and be saved only with difficulty and after suffering.

It will be noted that the Apostle speaks as if the day of judgment might come in the lifetime of those to whom he writes. Similar language is used by him in xv. 51; Phil. iii. 20; iv. 5; 1 Thess. iv. 14-17; v. 23; Tit. ii. 13. Yet he cannot have meant to teach that the day of judgment would *certainly* come in their lifetime, for he must have known that Christ had declared: "But of that day and hour no one knoweth, not even the angels of heaven, but the Father alone" (Matt. xxiv. 36). Moreover, in this very Epistle (vi. 14) he speaks as if he and his readers might be dead before that time; in 1 Tim. vi. 15 he says that the Second Coming will take place in God's *own times*, and in Eph. ii. 7 he speaks of ages still to come. He was in ignorance, then, as to the time of Christ's Second Coming and of the general judgment, and he can hardly have been unaware of his ignorance. It would not, indeed, be incompatible with this consciousness of their ignorance as to the exact time of the Second Coming, that he and other New Testament writers should have had an idea that it was not far off (cf. James v. 7, 8; 1 Pet. iv. 7), but in the light of Eph. ii. 7; 1 Tim. vi. 15; 2 Pet. iii. 8, 9, not to speak of the ordinary Catholic teaching on inspiration, we cannot admit that they could have meant to *teach* this.

quasi per ignem. ¹⁶ Nescitis ¹⁶ Know you not that you are
quia templum Dei estis, et the temple of God, and that the
Spiritus Dei habitat in vobis ? Spirit of God dwelleth in you ?

If the view set forth above be correct, there is no reference in this passage (verses 12-15) to the fire of Purgatory, nor even to Purgatory itself. But an argument for the Catholic doctrine of the existence of Purgatory may be deduced from the passage. For if the less worthy teachers who shall be alive at the last day, shall be saved only after a purging process in the great final conflagration, then unless the lot of such is to be worse than that of other venially offending teachers (and Christians generally) who are to die before the last day, these too, in case they die without having fully satisfied for their sins, must pass through some equivalent purging process.

Nothing can be deduced from the passage as to whether there is fire in Purgatory ; and the Church has defined nothing on this point. All that is of faith regarding Purgatory was defined by the Council of Florence (*Decret. pro Græcis*), viz. : " that the souls of those who have died truly penitent and in the charity of God, before they have satisfied by worthy fruits of penance for their sins of commission and omission are cleansed by the pains of Purgatory after death, and that towards their relief from such pains, they are helped by the suffrages of the faithful who are alive, that is to say, by Masses, prayers and alms, and other works of piety."

16. The connection seems to be : you must not wonder at the severity of God's dealings with the imperfect teachers, for the work in which they are engaged is a sacred work. " Know you not that you are the (a) temple of God ! " Already in verse 11 he had spoken of the Corinthian Church as a house of God or God's building, now he says that it is God's temple, God's special, and sacred dwelling-place, and he proves this by adding : " and (' for '—καὶ is exepexegetic) the Spirit of God dwelleth in you." It is clearly meant that the indwelling of the Spirit of God makes the Corinthian Church a temple of God, and hence, as the Fathers argued from this verse, the Spirit of God is God, and we have an argument for the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. It is worthy of note that the Apostle does not say here : know you not that you are temples of God, for it is the Church of Corinth, not its members individually, that the Apostle is here addressing.

¹⁷ Si quis autem templum Dei violaverit, disperdet illum Deus. Templum enim Dei sanctum est, quod estis vos.

¹⁸ Nemo se seducat : si quis videtur inter vos sapiens esse

¹⁷ But if any man violate the temple of God ; him shall God destroy. For the temple of God is holy : which you are.

¹⁸ Let no man deceive himself : if any man among you

17. The Apostle now alludes to a possible third class of teachers, who instead of building on the true foundation and helping to raise up the house of God whose foundation Paul had laid, would endeavour to destroy that house by preaching false doctrine. "But if any man violate (φθίπει) the temple of God, him shall God destroy" (φθίπει). In the Greek we have the same verb, though in different tenses, in the protasis and apodosis ; and the *Vetus Itala* rendered : "si quis templum Dei corruperit, corrumpet illum Deus," and the Revised Version : "If any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy." Not that any man could destroy the whole church of God, but a particular church like that of Corinth, false teachers might destroy. Here St. Paul declares that if anyone should do so, God shall put the "lex talionis" in force against him, and the destroyer shall be destroyed, lost for ever.

And the reason is : "for the temple of God is holy : which you are" (οἱ τινές ἐστε ὁμοίως). The last words may mean "and holy are ye," or rather "and ye are a temple." The relative is attracted into the plural because of the pronoun following.

18. The Apostle proceeds to draw practical conclusions from all that he has said regarding teachers.

"Let no man deceive himself." We prefer to understand this warning generally in reference to both teachers and followers. The phrase : "deceive himself" implies that, after all the Apostle has said, their ignorance would in future be culpable. This is the only instance where St. Paul uses this phrase ; elsewhere he uses : "do not err" (μὴ πλανᾶσθε, vi. 9 ; xv. 33 ; Gal. vi. 7), which need not refer to culpable error.—"If any among you (though possibly not of you) seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise." These words are addressed to the teachers, so that after the general admonition : "Let no man deceive himself," the Apostle now turns first to the teachers, and then in 21-23 to their followers.

The words rendered "seem to be wise" (δοκεῖ σοφὸς εἶναι) may mean either "seem to you to be wise," or, and this is more likely

in hoc sæculo, stultus fiat ut sit sapiens. ¹⁸ Sapientia enim huius mundi, stultitia est apud Deum. Scriptum est enim : Comprehendam sapientes in astutia eorum. ²⁰ Et iterum : Dominus novit cogitationes sapientium, quoniam vanæ

seem to be wise in this world, let him become a fool that he may be wise. ¹⁸ For the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God. For it is written : *I will catch the wise in their own craftiness.* ²⁰ And again : *The Lord knoweth the thoughts of the*

here, "seem to himself to be wise" (cf. viii. 2, x. 12, xiv. 37; James i. 26). The words "in this world" are connected by some with what follows : let him become foolish in this world, in order that he may become (γένηται) really wise. But the connection with what precedes, as in our version, seems to us more likely, and the sense is : "if any man fancy himself to be a shrewd man of the world, let him submit his whole mind, his understanding and will to the Gospel of Christ, which the world regards as folly (i. 18-23), in order that he may become really wise."

19. To prove that the wisdom of this world is foolishness in the judgment of God, two passages of the Old Testament are quoted, introduced by the usual solemn formula : "It is written." The first passage is the saying of Eliphaz, one of the friends of Job. From the way in which St. Paul introduces it ("It is written"), and because he sets it side by side with the passage from the Psalm, we must conclude that he regarded it as having Divine authority.

Instead of "I will catch," the true reading has the relative and participle (ὁ ἐκπαύμενος). The quotation agrees almost exactly with the Hebrew, and substantially with the LXX, which reads as follows : ὁ καταλαβόμενος σοφοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐπονίᾳ. The meaning clearly is that God turns against themselves the craftiness (προνουπία, "readiness for anything") of the worldly wise, and they are caught in it as in a snare. St. Thomas exemplifies this by the case of Joseph. His brothers sold Joseph into slavery, but this very action of theirs enabled him to become ruler of Egypt.

20. The same truth is proved by another quotation bearing on the same point. Hence the words : "and again." Instead of "the thoughts of the wise" both the Hebrew and LXX read : "the thoughts of man," but the change is one of form and not of sense, for it is of man influenced by false wisdom that the original speaks.

sunt. ²¹ Nemo itaque gloriatur in hominibus. = Omnia enim vestra sunt, sive Paulus, sive Apollo, sive Cephas, sive mundus, sive vita, sive mors, sive praesentia, sive futura : omnia

wise, that they are vain. ²¹ Let no man therefore glory in men. ²² For all things are yours, whether it be Paul, or Apollo, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come : all are yours :

21. The Apostle gave the general warning in v. 18 : " let no man deceive himself." Then turning to the teachers he showed how little the wisdom of the world counts for with God. Now turning to the faithful, and mindful of what he has said to the teachers in vv. 19, 20, he concludes that if wisdom counts for so little with God, it is folly to glory in any teacher on account of it : " So then let no one glory in men."

22. The conclusion drawn in the preceding verse is further established by a new argument, which, as St. Thomas points out, is founded on the dignity of Christians.

" For all things are yours," *i.e.*, on your account, for your sakes ; they are all but instruments to an end ; in the case of the teachers, instruments through whose instrumentality you embraced, or were confirmed in, the faith (v. 5). So far then from your belonging to them, as you seem to think (i. 12), they rather belong to you, they are all for your sakes, your servants (2 Cor. iv. 5), and, as in the next verse, you belong (only) to Christ. But the Apostle is not satisfied with saying that the various teachers were for the sake of the faithful, though that would have sufficed for his immediate purpose ; but to point out the dignity of Christians he declares that *all things* (πάντα) are for their sake, " whether it be Paul or Apollos or Cephas (named in the order of ascending merit as in i. 12, the Apostle through humility naming himself first) " or the world," the whole visible creation—" or life," as time for meriting—" or death," as the gate through which they pass to their reward—" or things present," the circumstances in which they were placed—" or things to come," the circumstances in which they would be placed afterwards in this world (though some refer this to the glory of the world to come), all, I say, are for your sake. The Vulgate and our Rheims Version read : " *for* all are yours," but the " for " is spurious. The past is not mentioned because it is not ours to shape it as we can the present and the future.

enim vestra sunt : ²² Vos autem ²³ And you are Christ's : and
Christi : Christus autem Dei. Christ is God's.

23. "And you are Christ's." You belong to Christ as your Lord and Head, and not merely to Christ as God, but to Christ as man, who in His human nature redeemed and purchased you (vi. 20 ; vii. 23).

"And Christ is God's." This is true in a certain sense even of Christ as God, inasmuch as He proceeds from the Father ; but we prefer the common view that the Apostle is speaking of Christ as man, of whom he says later on : "then shall the Son Himself be subjected to Him that subjected all things unto Him, that God may be all in all" (xv. 28).

The conclusion, then, is, that the Corinthians must not glory in men, but in God alone to whom all things of right belong, and who has graciously disposed all things for the sake of His elect.

CHAPTER IV

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

St. Paul and the other teachers are to be looked upon as stewards of Christ, in whom fidelity to their duty is the great requisite (vv. 1-2). Though not conscious to himself of any shortcoming in the discharge of his duty, St. Paul does not judge himself and hold himself just, but leaves the judgment to God, to whom the Corinthians also must leave all judgment of their teachers (2-5). They must not be puffed up or proud, but learn humility from the Apostles (6-13). St. Paul is their father in the faith, and as a father he expects to be imitated by them (14-18). Though some act as if he were not to return to Corinth, he will come, and if necessary deal severely (18-21).

¹ Sic nos existimet homo ut	¹ LET a man so account of
ministros Christi, et dispensa-	us as of the ministers of
	Christ, and the dispensers of

1. Instead of preferring one teacher to another on account of learning or eloquence, they must look upon all in the same light, namely, as ministers of Christ, etc.

"A man" (ἄνθρωπος) is put (as frequently the Hebrew אִישׁ) for "each one." "So" refers to what follows: in this (following) manner let each one regard us.

"Account of us" (λογίζεσθω), i.e., regard us, reckon us, as we really are (note again that *ὡς* does not imply similarity but identity as in iii. 1), "ministers of Christ." The Greek word used here for minister sometimes means any servant, sometimes a public servant, as of a law-court or synagogue; in Ecclesiastical Greek it designates a subdeacon. Here it means simply servants, or perhaps official ministers of Christ.

"And (the) dispensers (οἰκονόμους, 'stewards') of the mysteries of God." They are not proprietors, but merely stewards seeing to the business of another. The "mysteries of God" either are, or include, the doctrines of the faith, which are so called because they are hidden from man naturally, and would be unknown to him but for God's revelation. Throughout the rest of the New Testament the word *μυστήριον* nowhere means a Sacrament in the Church sense, and the whole context here in which St. Paul

tores mysteriorum Dei. * Hic the mysteries of God. * Here iam quaeritur inter dispensa- now it is required among the tores, ut fidelis quis inveniatur. dispensers, that a man be

is speaking of teachers, sent to preach (i. 17), who speak the wisdom of God in a *mystery* (ii. 7) goes to show that *doctrines* are at least included in the mysteries of which the Apostles are stewards. But are the Sacraments of the New Law excluded? Certainly not the *doctrine* about the Sacraments, for this formed an important part of the preaching of the Apostles (cf. xi. 23 ff.). As stewards they had to deal with the Sacramental, among the other mysterious doctrines of the faith, and this undoubtedly follows from the text. But the text does not mean that they were to be regarded as "dispensers of the mysteries of God," in the sense that they were ministers of the Sacraments. Such, indeed, they sometimes were (i. 14, 16), but most probably nothing is said to that effect here.

It is true the Council of Trent (Sess. xxi. *De Commun.*, Cap. 2) says: "Hanc potestatem perpetuo in Ecclesia fuisse, ut in sacramentorum dispensatione, salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret quae suscipientum utilitati, seu ipsorum Sacramentorum venerationi, pro rerum, temporum et locorum varietate magis expedire judicaret; id autem Apostolus non obscure visus est innuissae, cum ait: Sic nos existimet homo ut ministros Christi et dispensatores mysteriorum Dei." But this declaration of the Council is quite consistent with our interpretation, nay, fits into it exactly. The Apostles, as Christ's stewards in the work of preaching and expounding the Christian doctrine, could so teach as to alter at times such of the teaching regarding the Sacraments and their administration as did not affect the Sacramental essence.

2. Read ὥστε with B¹ACDFG and all the VV., and not ὅτι; ὥστε means either "here on earth and in earthly matters," or "in this state of things," i.e., seeing that we are stewards; and λοιπόν (the accusative of respect used adverbially) is merely a particle of transition = "now." The sense, therefore, is: "now in worldly matters, the great requisite in stewards is that one be found faithful." Or: "now, this being so, the great requisite in stewards is," etc. In a steward it is fidelity to his master's work and wishes, and not great learning or eloquence that is chiefly looked for. For the Vulgate "inter dispensatores" we ought rather render "in dispensatoribus."

² Mihi autem pro minimo est ut a vobis iudicer, aut ab humano die : sed neque meipsum iudico. ⁴ Nihil enim mihi conscius sum : sed non in hoc iustificatus sum ; qui autem iudicat me, Dominus est.

found faithful. ² But to me it is a very small thing to be judged by you, or by man's day : but neither do I judge my own self. ⁴ For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet am I not hereby justified : but he that judgeth me, is the Lord.

3. Yet even in this respect of fidelity, the Corinthians are not to judge, but are to leave the question of their teachers' fidelity to the judgment of God. "But to me it is a very small thing"—it comes to little, is of little importance—"that I should be judged—preferred to others or held inferior to them—by you or by any human judgment."—"Man's day" is put for man's judgment. "Itaque humanus dies vocatur ille qui ab hominibus iudiciis exercendis destinatus est, in oppositione ad domini diem, quem Apostolus statim describit ; dies autem iudiciis destinatus per figuram ponitur pro ipso homine iudicante" (Corn.).

"But neither do I judge my own self." Rather : "Yea, not even do I judge my own self."

4. "For I am not conscious to myself of anything, yet am I not hereby justified." The context shows the meaning to be that the Apostle is not conscious of any shortcoming in the work of a minister of Christ and dispenser of the mysteries of God. But for the very same reason that St. Paul, though conscious of no shortcoming, could not say with absolute certainty that he was justified in the work of a steward of Christ, so Christians generally cannot say with certainty that they are justified. Hence the Protestant theory that faith is "*fiducia*" or absolute confidence in the promises of God and firm *belief* that we are justified by Him, is overturned by the present text. Such firm belief in his own justification was plainly impossible even to such a man as St. Paul ; and moreover he tells us so while writing under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost. Hence the Council of Trent (Sess. vi, Can. xiv) defined : "Si quis dixerit hominem a peccatis absolvi, ac justificari ex eo quod se absolvi ac justificari certo credat ; aut neminem vere esse iustificatum nisi qui credat se esse iustificatum, et hac sola fide absolutionem et justificationem perfici, anathema sit." *

* See also Co. of Trent, Sess., vi, Cap. ix.

⁴ Itaque nolite ante tempus
iudicare, quoadusque veniat
Dominus, qui et illuminabit
abscondita tenebrarum, et
manifestabit consilia cordium :

⁴ Therefore judge not before
the time : until the Lord come,
who both will bring to light
the hidden things of darkness,
and will make manifest the
counsels of the hearts : and

5. The Apostle concludes that the Corinthians ought to leave off passing any judgment, whether of comparison or otherwise (note that for *ἐνσφύρω*, used of the judgment of comparison, is now substituted *κρίνω*), on their teachers until the day of judgment. Then indeed they shall judge with Christ, for He asks them in vi. 2 : " Know you not that the saints shall judge this world ? " And they shall then be in a position to judge, for the Lord " both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the hearts." " The hidden things of darkness " are taken by some to refer only to secret *bad* actions. But it is by far the more common and the more probable opinion that there is question of all actions hidden in darkness, of all secret actions whether good or bad, for it is only after both classes have been made known that a just judgment can be passed. And not only secret external acts but even the thoughts of men shall be manifested on that day of the Lord's coming. And then shall every man have praise (*ὁ ἔκδοσις*, " the praise "), the praise which is his due, from God.

Since, of course, all men shall not be praised by God on the last day, some have felt a difficulty in explaining this clause. Some have held that *ἐκδοσις*, somewhat like the Latin " fama," may be used either of praise or blame, so that it would be stated here that every man shall then get his deserts (from God). But attention to the context will show that the Apostle is speaking still of the Corinthian teachers, whom the Corinthians are forbidden to judge, and whom God shall one day judge, and then each of these teachers shall receive from God the praise that he deserves. Hence the Corinthians must abstain from preferring one to another and from judging them at all ; they shall one day be judged, and get the praise they deserve from Him whose praise cannot be misplaced. It is implied in the preceding part of this verse, where it is said " the Lord will bring to light," etc., that Christ Himself will apportion the praise on the last day, and in Matt. xxv. 34 this is distinctly stated of Him : " Then shall the King say to them that shall be on His right hand :

et tunc laus erit unicuique a Deo. . . then shall every man have praise from God.

* Haec autem, fratres, transfiguravi in me et Apollo, pro- * But these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred

Come ye blessed of *my Father*, possess you the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." (See also John v. 22). Hence "God" seems to refer to Christ; if so, we have a distinct statement of His Divinity.

6. "But these things, brethren, I have in a figure transferred to myself and (to) Apollos for your sakes." The verb μετασχηματίζειν means to transform, to change the form of anything. Hence it means to change the form of a discourse, by applying, as in the present instance, to one or two, what was meant to be applied to all the Corinthian teachers.

But to what does the Apostle refer in "these things," which he says he has transferred in a figure to himself and Apollos? Does he mean that in reality there were no factions in Corinth calling themselves after himself and Apollos and Cephas, and that he had merely used these names to spare the feelings of the real heads of the factions? So thought St. Chrysostom, and many commentators, both Greek and Latin. But this view seems improbable, because St. Clement of Rome, writing to the Corinthians before the end of the first century (about 97 A.D.) supposes that there had been factions at Corinth naming themselves after Paul and Apollos and Cephas, and because the plain meaning not alone of i. 12, but also of iii. 4 and iii. 22 requires this.

Hence the Apostle has not so changed the form of his discourse as to allude to factions: Petrines, Paulines, Apollonians, that had no real existence. But he has spoken only of himself and Apollos and Cephas at the same time that he meant what he said to be true of all teachers and their adherents, and this was really a departure from the natural form of words and was a *metaschematismus*.

Some commentators, however, are of opinion that "these things" in the present verse does not refer to all that has been said from the beginning of the Epistle regarding the heads of factions and their adherents, but only to the sections iii. 4-9 and iv. i ff., where the Apostle points out the true condition of Apostles and teachers, namely, that they are only ministers. So Cornely and others. But ταῦτα ("these things") may well

pter vos : ut in nobis discatis,
ne supra quam scriptum est,
unus adversus alterum infletur
pro alio. ' Quis enim te dis-

to myself and to Apollo, for
your sakes ; that in us you
may learn, that one be not
puffed up against the other for
another, above that which is
written. ' For who distin-

refer to all that has been said about the heads of factions from the beginning of the Epistle, and though it is true that only Paul and Apollos (and not Cephas) are named in the present verse, as in iii. 4, yet in both instances we believe with Estius that Peter's name is to be understood, and is suppressed simply through reverence and respect. In the section iii. 4-9, to which Cornely makes " these things " refer, not one word is said of Paul and Apollos that was not also true of Cephas, for he, too, though head of the Apostles and of the Church, was yet only a minister and servant of Christ.

" That in us you may learn that one be not puffed up against the other for another, above that which is written."

The meaning of this, the Vulgate reading is that Paul had written in this way in order that they might learn that one of the faithful was not to be puffed up against another on account of some particular teacher, beyond what is permitted (" that which is written ").

The Greek reading, however : *ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθῃτε τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ὃ (or δ) γέγραπται, ἵνα μὴ εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου*, " that in us you may learn this, namely, not (to be puffed up) beyond that which is written, that no one of you be puffed up for the one against the other," gives a somewhat different sense. They are to learn two things ; first they are to conform to the standard of that which is written, and so, secondly, they are not to be puffed up against another of the faithful for any one teacher.

" That which is written " is understood by some of the preceding part of this Epistle, by others of some of the sayings of Christ recorded in the Gospels (e.g., Matt. vii. 1, 3 ; xx. 27 ; xxiii. 12), but it is most naturally referred to the general teaching of the Old Testament regarding humility.

7. " For who distinguisheth thee ! " There is a difference of opinion as to whom the Apostle here addresses. Very many commentators, and among them some of the ablest, as Est., Lap., Corn., hold that the Apostle now turns to the Corinthian teachers and addresses them as far as the end of verse 13. But

cernit? Quid autem habes quod non accepisti? Si autem

guisheth thee? Or what hast thou that thou hast not re-

there is nothing in the section that may not be well explained as addressed to the Corinthian faithful. Moreover, the close connection between verses 6 and 7 shows that it is the one who is not to be puffed up (that is, one of the faithful), that is now addressed in verse 7. It is as if the Apostle said: You are not to be puffed against your brother for any teacher. Why should you? For who distinguisheth you? Again, in verse 14, the faithful are certainly addressed, and neither there, nor here in verse 7, is there the slightest indication of a transition. We hold, then, with St. Thomas, and most of the Fathers, that in the section vv. 7-13, the faithful are addressed.

And, now, what is the meaning of the clause: "for who distinguisheth thee"? It seems to mean: who finds anything of good in you more than in your neighbours, on account of which he may in thought separate you from them and prefer you to them? The answer expected is that no one rightly does so, for either you have nothing in you more than others, or if you have anything, whether of nature or grace, it is not from yourself but from God, as the next question indicates. Others take the meaning of $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \gamma\acute{o}\rho\ \alpha\epsilon\ \delta\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\iota}\nu\epsilon\iota$; to be: "for who maketh thee to differ?" But the natural answer then would be: God maketh me to differ, and thus this clause and the next would be tautological.

"Or (rather 'and' or 'but') what hast thou that thou hast not received?" All their gifts, whether of nature or grace, were from God, in whom therefore, and not in themselves or in any teacher, they ought to glory.

"And if thou also (as well as others— $\kappa\alpha\iota$) hast received (didst receive), why, etc.?" The plain conclusion is, that since all they have and are is from God, they have nothing on account of which they may reasonably be puffed up against their neighbour.

This interpretation supposes that the Apostle, addressing the Corinthian faithful, attributes all their gifts to God. And certainly, though the majority of commentators are against us, we cannot believe that there is question only of *natural* gifts, for in the very next verse the Apostle goes on to speak of their fancied riches, which are admittedly not riches in the natural order, or this world's riches, but riches in the supernatural order. Indeed the view that there is question of natural gifts is founded

accepisti, quid gloriaris quasi non acceperis ?

* Iam saturati estis, iam divites facti estis, sine nobis

ceived ? and if thou hast received, why dost thou glory, as if thou hadst not received it ? * You are now full : you are now become rich : you

upon what we consider the mistaken view that this verse is addressed to teachers. And it must not be forgotten that the Fathers commonly (as distinct from commentators) and St. Thomas understood this verse in reference to supernatural as well as natural gifts, and hence they proved from it, as though directly conveyed by it, that in the supernatural order man can do nothing without God. St. Augustine was never tired of urging this verse against the Pelagians and Semipelagians to prove that man cannot accomplish, nor even begin, a salutary work without the grace of God, and the Second Council of Orange (c. 6) declared : "Apostolo dicenti : Quid habes, quod non accepisti, resistere eos, qui gratiam ex operibus nostris naturalibus, non vero opera nostra bona ex gratia esse asserant."

8. Continuing to address the faithful, he cries out : "You are now (rather : ' already ') full ; you are now (' already ') become rich ; you reign (*ἡγουσθεσθαι*, you have attained to the kingdom) without us ! " The same idea is conveyed in three metaphors. The first is taken from persons satiated with food, the second from those so rich as to want no more, the third from those raised to the highest dignity, and having nothing further to desire. The sense is that in their own estimation they seemed to enjoy all the blessings of the glorious kingdom of Christ, nay to be in possession of the kingdom itself, and this *already* in this life, while others must wait for such happiness until the life to come. Then he adds : " And I would to God," etc. The Vulgate would be better : " et utinam regnassetis, ut . . . regnaremus." He wishes it were indeed true that they shared in the glorious reign of Christ, because then he, their Apostle, might fairly hope soon to share in it too, and partake with them of its blessings.

We believe that the mention of reigning in this verse is the reason why so many commentators have held that in this section the Apostle addresses the teachers. But the explanation we have given explains the words naturally in regard to the faithful, and in fact it is hardly possible to explain them in reference to the authority exercised over the Corinthian faithful by imperfect Corinthian teachers, for St. Paul could not sincerely wish that

regnatis : et utinam regnetis, ut et nos vobiscum regnemus. ⁹ Puto enim quod Deus nos apostolos novissimos ostendit, tanquam morti destinatos : quia spectaculum facti sumus mundo, et angelis, et hominibus. ¹⁰ Nos stulti propter Christum, vos autem prudentes

reign without us ; and I would to God you did reign, that we also might reign with you. ⁹ For I think that God hath set forth us apostles, the last, as it were men appointed to death : we are made a spectacle to the world, and to Angels, and to men. ¹⁰ We are fools for Christ's sake, but you are

such men had authority, nor would he desire to share in authority with them. I am aware of course that it is sought to meet this by saying that the Apostle's meaning is : You have attained to authority ; and would that you *exercised that authority rightly*, etc., etc., but this requires that ἀπολλύσκει be taken in a different sense in the two clauses, a resource which ought not to be adopted unless necessity demand it.

9. " For I think that," etc. The connection with the preceding is not very clear. Perhaps he gives the reason why he longs to share in the glorious reign of Christ, a reason drawn from the hard lot on earth of himself and the other Apostles. " Hath set forth us," the Apostles, as though we were last and least among men, as though we were men condemned to death, *for* " we are made a spectacle to the world, and (= ' both ') to angels and to men." Θέσπερ (" a spectacle ") is primarily a theatre or circus ; then, as here, the spectacle exhibited therein. Good angels and good men beheld the labours and trials of the Apostles with compassion, admiration, and sympathy ; bad angels and bad men with pleasure and delight.

10. He proceeds to specify how he and the other Apostles are made a spectacle, at the same time contrasting their condition with that in which the Corinthian Christians fancied themselves to be. " We are fools for Christ's sake, but you are wise in Christ " ; i.e., we Apostles preaching in simple language the doctrine of Christ crucified, are regarded by the world as fools (i. 18, 23), and this we submit to for Christ's sake, to do His will and promote His Gospel ; you, hankering after learned preachers and the world's wisdom, regard yourselves as wise and prudent and already united to Christ (φρόνιμοι ἐν Χριστῷ). " We are weak, but you are strong," i.e., we are devoid of all human aids and hence naturally regarded as *weak*, but you are " great people," able to rely upon yourselves. " You are honourable, but we

in Christo : nos infirmi, vos autem fortes : vos nobiles, nos autem ignobiles. ¹⁰ Usque in hanc horam et esurimus, et sitimus, et nudi sumus, et colaphis caedimur, et instabiles sumus. ¹¹ Et laboramus operantes manibus nostris, maledicimur, et benedicimus : persecutionem patimur, et sustinemus : ¹² Blasphemamur, et obsecramus : tanquam purga-

wise in Christ : we are weak, but you are strong : you are honourable, but we without honour. ¹⁰ Even unto this hour we both hunger, and thirst, and are naked, and are buffeted, and have no fixed abode, ¹¹ And we labour working with our own hands : we are reviled, and we bless : we are persecuted, and we suffer it. ¹² We are blasphemed, and we en-

without honour " (Revised Version : " Ye have glory, but we have dishonour "), i.e., we are without honour, and despised by the world ; you esteem yourselves and want to be held in esteem because of your preference for the world's wisdom and eloquence. The whole verse is regarded by many as ironical, and it would seem that at least the clauses referring to the Corinthians, if not those to the Apostles, are.

11. " Even unto this hour " ($\delta\epsilon\upsilon\tau\epsilon\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\eta\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\rho\epsilon\varsigma$ —" this present hour ").—" And are naked." The Greek verb properly means to be scantily clad (like the $\gamma\upsilon\mu\alpha\sigma\tau\eta\varsigma$), and from the context here to be ill clad.—" And are buffeted." The Greek verb properly means to strike with the fist, then in a more general sense to treat ignominiously.

12. That St. Paul laboured with his own hands, see Acts xviii. 3 ; xx. 34 ; 1 Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8 ; but he is speaking here not of himself alone but of the Apostles generally (cf. v. 9). Having indicated something of what the Apostles had to bear, he proceeds to indicate the spirit in which they bore it : " We are reviled, and we bless," etc.

13. " We are blasphemed and we entreat." The Greek has " being blasphemed," and so in the two preceding clauses the first verb of our version in each represents a participle in the original. The meaning is : Being defamed or calumniated, we yet entreat, i.e., abstaining from retaliating, we merely beseech them to use us better. Some have taken the sense to be " we entreat God for them."

The climax of this beautiful description of the condition of the Apostles is reached in the words that follow : " We are made as the refuse of this (' the ') world, the off-scouring of all even until now." The Greek word for " refuse " means that

menta huius mundi facti sumus, omnium peripsema usque adhuc.

¹⁴ Non ut confundam vos, hæc scribo, sed ut filios meos charissimos moneo. ¹⁵ Nam si decem millia paedagogorum habeatis in Christo, sed non

treat: we are made as the refuse of this world, the off-scouring of all even until now.

¹⁴ I write not these things to confound you; but I admonish you as my dearest children:

¹⁵ For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers. For in Jesus

which is removed in the process of cleansing, *e.g.*, the dirt removed from a room or house; St. Paul indicates that not in one house or city but wherever they went in *the world*, the Apostles were regarded as dirt, as vile and to be swept away. The other Greek word (from περιπλάω, I rub or wipe all round) is well rendered by "off-scourings." By both expressions, says Estius, "significatur extrema vilitas et contemptus," and it seems to us very doubtful if anything further is meant. Some, however, find in both terms an allusion to expiatory sacrifices, as though the Apostle spoke of himself and his fellow Apostles as expiatory sacrifices offered to promote the salvation of men. Estius denies that either word has ever such a signification, but in this he seems to be mistaken. "It was the custom at Athens to reserve certain worthless persons, whom in case of plague, famine, or other visitations from heaven, they used to throw into the sea in the belief that they would *cleanse away or wipe off the guilt of the nation*, saying περιπλημα ἡμῶν γινεῖται. These were called καθάρματα, περικαθάρματα, περιπρήματα" (Lidd. and Scott. *Gr.—Eng. Lex.* on καθάρμα). There seems to be no doubt, therefore, that the words could bear this meaning, but the context here inclines us to the view that it is not intended.

14. Here, according to all, and as is proved by v. 15, it is the faithful who are addressed. But there is nothing whatever to indicate that the "you" of this verse are not also the "you" of verse 10.

"To confound you," *i.e.*, to put you to shame. His purpose was to admonish them, though no doubt he knew that what he had just said was calculated at the same time to shame them.

15. That their comparative forgetfulness of himself and preference for more eloquent teachers suggested the preceding remarks (7-13), seems to follow from this verse. It is as if he said, you must not forget me nor prefer more showy or more florid preachers to me, for I am your father in the faith.

multos patres. Nam in CHRISTO IESU per evangelium ego vos genui. ¹⁶ Rogo ego vos, imitatores mei estote, sicut et ego Christi. ¹⁷ Ideo misi ad vos Timotheum, qui est filius meus charissimus, et fidelis in Domino : qui vos commonefaciet

CHRIST by the gospel I have begotten you : ¹⁶ Wherefore I beseech you, be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ. ¹⁷ For this cause have I sent to you Timothy, who is my dearest son and faithful in the Lord ; who will put you in

" For if you have (rather, ' though you should have ') ten thousand instructors in Christ, yet not many fathers." The παιδαγωγός (from παῖς and ἄγω) among the Greeks and Romans was sometimes a slave, sometimes a freedman, who accompanied the boys committed to his charge to and from play and school, and in some cases gave them elementary teaching, holding in their regard the place of a tutor. St. Paul uses the word only here and in Gal. iii. 24, 25. He refers here to the teachers who had or might come after him in Corinth. As St. Thomas puts it : " Eadem est, quantum ad prædicationem evangelii, comparatio paedagogi ad patrem, quæ est rigatoris ad plantatorem et superædificatoris ad fundatorem." The Apostle means that, however many teachers may come after him, yet his own relation to the Corinthians is unique ; he is the founder of their church, their spiritual father.—" For in Christ Jesus by the Gospel I have begotten (begat) you." In these words he indicates that the paternity to which he lays claim is spiritual. He means that through his instrumentality God called them to the faith, for it is " God that giveth the increase," iii. 7. Estius takes : " in Christo vos genui " to mean " genui vos Christianos," while others prefer to regard " in Christ " as equivalent to " by the grace and power of Christ."

16. " Ego " of the Vulgate is a typographical error for " ergo " (οὖν), and the concluding words, " as I also am of Christ," are spurious here, inserted by some scribe from xi. 1, where they are genuine. The sense of the verse is : Since I am your father I beseech you *therefore*, as it is natural that children should love and imitate their father more than any pedagogue, be ye imitators (μιμηταί) of me.

17. For this cause, namely, that they might imitate him, he had sent Timothy, his dearest son and faithful in the things of the Lord, to remind them of his ways. Before this letter was written Timothy had been sent into Macedonia (Acts xix. 22),

vias meas, quae sunt in CHRISTO IESU, sicut ubique in omni ecclesia doceo. ¹⁸ Tanquam non venturus sim ad vos, sic inflati sunt quidam. ¹⁹ Veniam autem ad vos cito, si Dominus voluerit: et cognoscam non sermonem eorum qui inflati sunt, sed virtutem. ²⁰ Non

mind of my ways, which are in CHRIST JESUS; as I teach everywhere in every church. ¹⁸ As if I would not come to you, so some are puffed up. ¹⁹ But I will come to you shortly, if the Lord will, and will know, not the speech of them that are puffed up, but the power. ²⁰ For the king-

apparently with instructions to go on to Corinth (xvi. 10). See Introd., p. xxii.

"My ways which are in Christ" (Jesus?). Many commentators understand by "ways" here St. Paul's doctrine, but the plural of *ὁδοί* is never used of one system of doctrine, and besides it is not the knowledge of Paul's doctrine, but the knowledge of his manner of life and methods of teaching that would help them to become imitators of him. Hence we agree with Cornely that the Apostle's whole manner of life and action, "*totum vitae meae institutum*" (Est.) is meant, and this was "in Christ Jesus" as inspired and aided by His grace.

"As (*καθώς*) I teach everywhere in every church." The connection of this clause is not clear. Many connect thus: I have sent Timothy to you to help you to imitate me, for we Apostles are to be imitated, as I teach everywhere in every church, so that nothing singular is required of you (Est.). Perhaps a more obvious connection is: who will remind you of my ways, *how*, *in what manner* I conduct myself as teacher in every church, though it must be admitted that the meaning here given to *διδάσκω* is forced.

18. Apparently some of his adversaries at Corinth had circulated a rumour that he would not attempt to return to the city. Possibly they suggested that he was deterred by the fact that he was no match in eloquence for Apollos. See Acts xviii. 24, 27, 28, and 2 Cor. x. 9-11.

19. "But the power." Probably the chief reference now is to preachers. Coming as judge, the Apostle will take account not of eloquence, but of their power to produce good fruit in their hearers. Power of working miracles is not meant, for that could not be set up as a test of good preachers, nor does the church depend upon it.

20. For not by discourses, however eloquent, is the church,

enim in sermone est regnum Dei, sed in virtute. ²¹ Quid vultis ? in virga veniam ad vos, an in charitate et spiritu mansuetudinis ?

dom of God is not in speech but in power. ²¹ What will you ? shall I come to you with a rod ; or in charity, and in the spirit of meekness ?

God's kingdom (established or perpetuated), but by efficacious preaching, by power (*δύναμις*) to influence men's lives. This power comes not from eloquence, but from God, as in ii. 5.

21. Ἐλθω is the subjunctive of deliberation (Beel., *Gr. Gr.*, p. 309, § 41, 4 B.), and ἐν ῥάβδῳ means "furnished with a rod," ἐν being used here after the manner of the Hebrew *בְּ*. The sense is : shall I come to punish, or to show towards you charity and the spirit of meekness ? Not as though he would lack charity even while punishing, but by those who are punished the charity of the father who punishes is not seen or appreciated. "Hoc autem non dicit, quia in virga veniens non cum caritate veniret, sed quia ille qui virga castigatur, non sentit dulcedinem caritatis" (St. Thomas). In this verse the Apostle is preparing the way for what he is about to say in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Apostle severely rebukes the Corinthian Church for not expelling from its bosom an incestuous adulterer, and indicates what punishment he himself intends to inflict upon him (vv. 1-5). He points out that such toleration of sinners is dangerous, and unworthy of Christians, who ought to celebrate a perpetual Pasch, free from all leaven of sin (6-8). Finally he explains what he meant by a precept that he had conveyed to them in a former letter (9-13).

¹ OMNINO auditur inter vos ¹ It is absolutely heard that
fornicatio et talis fornicatio, there is fornication among you,

1. From the subject of factions the Apostle now passes to another scandal in the Corinthian Church (which had apparently reached him by popular rumour), namely, that one of their members was guilty of a shocking crime of adulterous incest, and that they had taken no steps to expel him from their body.

"It is absolutely heard that there is fornication among you." A more accurate rendering would be: "Actually there is a report of (the existence of) unlawful sexual intercourse (πορνεία)* among you."

"And such," etc. Two things are said to be reported: first, that there is unlawful sexual intercourse, and secondly, that it is of an unusual and very scandalous type, inasmuch as one among them "hath his father's wife." It is not the sinner's own mother that is meant, but his step-mother. If, as is more probable, there is reference to this same case in 2 Cor. vii. 12, then the father was still alive when the scandal occurred.

It is disputed whether the incestuous Corinthian was only living in concubinage with his step-mother or had even attempted an incestuous marriage with her. It is in favour of the latter view that the crime is said not to exist even among the Gentiles (cf. Cicero, *Pro Cluentio*, 5, 6), whereas incestuous adultery was not unknown even among the Jews (Gen. xxxv. 22; 2 Kings xvi. 21). Moreover, the aorists in vv. 2-3 (ποίησας . . . κατέπα-

* "Vocabulum hoc latissime patet . . . omnis generis impudicitiam, quocunque modo se exserat, incestum, adulterium . . . significat, ut adeo in singulis locis N.T. vel omnes hae notiones aut pleraeque conjungendae sint, aut ex oratione contexta definiendum sit, de quonam impudicitiae genere πορνεία accipiendum sit" (Schleusner, *Lex. Graec.-Lat. in N.T.*).

qualis nec inter gentes, ita ut and such fornication as the like
 uxorem patris sui aliquis is not among the heathens;
 habeat. * Et vos inflati cœtis : that one should have his
 father's wife. * And you are

πορεύεσθαι) seem to point back to an attempted marriage rather than to the state of concubinage. Since then πορεία may denote any unlawful sexual intercourse, we are justified by the context here in understanding it of an intercourse consequent upon an attempted incestuous marriage, which of course was invalid.* It is objected that such a marriage was forbidden by Roman law, and therefore could not have taken place in Corinth. But it may be replied that possibly the Roman authorities did not trouble themselves to inquire into Jewish or Christian Marriage laws. The Romans were in the habit of allowing great liberty to subject peoples in following their own customs—to which, indeed, their success as colonists was largely due—and they may not have cared to look too closely into the marriage usages of the Corinthian Christians. When St. Paul was arraigned before the Roman Proconsul, Gallio at Corinth, Gallio said to the Jews: "If it were some matter of injustice, or an heinous deed, O Jews, I should with reason bear with you. But if they be questions about words and names and your own law, look you to it: I will not be judge of such things" (Acts xviii. 12 ff.).

As the Apostle says nothing about the sin of the step-mother, it is rightly inferred that she was not a Christian, and that St. Paul had no authority over her (cf. *r.* 12).

2. Having indicated the enormity of the sin of the incestuous Corinthian, the Apostle now rounds upon the Christians of Corinth for tolerating such a sinner in their communion. "And you," he says, "are puffed up and have not rather mourned" (or: "And are you puffed up? And did you not rather mourn?") to the end that he that had done this thing might be excluded from communion with you and excommunicated.

3-5. On this passage, *ec.* 3-5, it will be well to premise a few remarks.

(1) "Jam judicavi" (ἤδη κέκρικα) seems to mean: "I have already decided," not: "I have already passed sentence upon."

* Cornely suggests that the same meaning may be given to πορεία in the difficult texts Matt. v. 32: κτλ. 9: but in this we cannot agree with him, for how then would it be true, as there stated, that he who should marry *anyone* put away would be guilty of adultery? A woman put away in the case of an incestuous marriage could marry again, since her first marriage would be invalid.

et non magis luctum habuistis puffed up ; and have not rather
ut tollatur de medio vestrum mourned, that he might be
taken away from among you,

For verse 4 shows that the actual delivering over to Satan is to take place when the Corinthians are met together.

(2). The principal sentence, then, is : I have already decided to deliver such a one to Satan.

(3). It is disputed what the punishment is, to which the Apostle refers in the words : " to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh." Some, as Estius, hold that there is question only of excommunication, and the sinner is said to be delivered to Satan because he is to be placed outside the pale of the Church and thus exposed, unaided by the Sacraments and suffrages of the Church, to the attacks of the devil. These take " for the destruction of the flesh," to mean : for the destruction of his carnal desires, " flesh " being understood to mean desires of the flesh. In this view the punishment which St. Paul here declares he has decided upon, is the same as that alluded to in verse 2, " that he might be taken away from among you," which the Corinthians had neglected to inflict, the same also to which, in verse 13, they are exhorted to proceed : " Put away the evil one from among yourselves."

A wholly different view, however, is taken of the passage by all the Greeks and most of the Latins. They think that the apostle speaks of a very special punishment in verses 3-5, a punishment different from and greater than that which he blames the Corinthians for not having inflicted. This punishment, upon which the Apostle says he had decided, was, according to this view, nothing less than a delivering over of the sinner to the power of the devil, so that the evil spirit should take corporal possession of him, and harass his body with disease or otherwise. And this would be permitted and willed by the Apostle for the punishment of the man's body, or " flesh," to the end that his soul might be saved ; it being hoped that his corporal sufferings would lead to his repentance. This extraordinary power not only of expelling demons from men's bodies, but of giving them possession of bodies, was, according to this view, possessed and exercised by the Apostles and their immediate successors in the early ages of the Church.

Though Estius argues strongly against this second view of the passage, we consider it more probable, both on account of

qui hoc opus fecit. ³ Ego quidem absens corpore, præsens autem spiritu, iam iudicavi ut præsens eum qui sic operatus est. ⁴ In nomine Domini nostri IESU CHRISTI, congregatis vobis et meo spiritu, cum virtute Domini nostri IESU, ⁵ Tradere huiusmodi Satanæ in

that hath done this deed. ³ I indeed absent in body, but present in spirit, have already judged, as though I were present, him that hath so done. ⁴ In the name of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, you being gathered together and my spirit, with the power of our Lord JESUS; ⁵ To deliver such

the great weight of authority in its favour and for internal reasons. We shall therefore explain the passage according to this view.

3. The true reading is: *ἐγὼ μὲν γάρ*: "For I indeed." The Apostle contrasts his own determination to inflict a very severe punishment with the neglect of the Corinthians to inflict the much lighter punishment of excommunication.

For I indeed (the pronoun being emphatic), absent in body (*ἄς*, found in some MSS. before *ἐνὶ σώματι*, is not genuine), but present in mind and heart, in solicitude, have already decided as though I were present in the body. What he had decided upon is expressed in verse 5. Then the words: "him that hath so done this," in the end of verse 3, depend upon the verb "to deliver" in verse 5. "So" refers to some aggravating circumstance unknown to us.

4. About the connection of the clauses: "in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ," "with the power of our Lord Jesus (Christ)," there are various views. Some connect both with "you being gathered together," others connect both with "to deliver"; others connect the first with "you being gathered together," the second with "to deliver"; while others again connect the first with "to deliver," the second with "you being gathered together." In this latter view, which seems best, the meaning is: I have decided, in the name and with the authority of our Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver such a one to Satan, you being gathered together and my spirit and Christ Himself being present in His power (Matt. xviii. 20) to ratify the sentence.

5. I have decided to give Satan power over his body to harass it, in order that he may be moved to repentance, and that his soul may be saved in the day of judgment.

The words: "for the destruction of the flesh" cannot mean "to bring about the death of his body," for we learn from 2 Cor. ii. 7-8 that the sinner did not die of this punishment, but

interitum carnis, ut spiritus
salvus sit in die Domini nostri
IESU CHRISTI.

* Non est bona gloriatio
vestra. Nescitis quia modicum

a one to Satan for the destruc-
tion of the flesh, that the spirit
may be saved in the day of our
Lord JESUS CHRIST.

* Your glorying is not good.
Know you not that a little

was converted and pardoned by St. Paul. The words may be taken, as Estius understands them, to mean : for the destruction of his carnal desires, or if *ὀλεθρον* be understood not of destruction strictly, but of punishment, harassing, etc., they may mean : " for the punishment of his body."

The three verses then may be paraphrased thus : For I indeed, absent in body, but present in solicitude, have already decided, as though I were actually present, to deliver to Satan him who hath so done this thing, that is to say, I have decided that, on a future occasion when you and my spirit and our Lord Jesus Christ in His power shall have been gathered together in one of your assemblies, I in the name and with the authority of Christ will deliver this man to Satan for the punishment of his body, in order that his soul may be saved.

In any view of the text, the method of procedure against the incestuous sinner is not very clear, but it may be that St. Paul supplemented what is here said by instructions given to those who carried this letter. He may have said, for instance, that on the occasion when the Corinthians would assemble solemnly to excommunicate the sinner, on that same occasion he, though far away in Ephesus, would inflict the still graver punishment. Of course he could have acted without waiting for the Corinthians to take action, but he may have wished in this way to stimulate them.

6-8. Having blamed their remissness (v. 2), and contrasted with it his own decision already arrived at (3-5), he now proceeds to urge the Corinthians to do their part and excommunicate the sinner. " Your glorying is not good," i.e., your boasting about your teachers and about your own exalted spiritual condition, is not good, especially when you allow such crimes to go unpunished among you. Doubtless he means, by litotes, that it is bad, and most unworthy and unbecoming in the circumstances.

For " corrupteth " the Greek is *ζυμοῖ* (leaveneth). The saying : " A little leaven leaveneth the whole mass " (of dough into which it is put or in which it is allowed to remain), was probably a

fermentum totam massam corrumpit? 'Expurgate vetus fermentum, ut sitis nova conspersio, sicut estis azymi. Etenim pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus. 'Itaque epulemur, non in fermento

leaven corrupteth the whole lump? 'Purge out the old leaven, that you may be a new paste, as you are unleavened. For Christ our pasch is sacrificed. 'Therefore let us feast, not with the old leaven, nor

proverbial expression, as it occurs again in Gal. v. 9. In the present instance the leaven may be understood either of the sin or the sinner; if we understand it of the sinner, as is the more common view, he was a *little* leaven, not with reference to quality but to quantity; he was only one in the church of Corinth. Or the argument may be a *fortiori*: if even a little leaven is so powerful, how much more such a scandalous sinner or sin as there is question of here.

7. "Purge out the old leaven." As the Jews were commanded before each Paschal festival to remove from their houses all the leaven and to celebrate the seven days of the feast with unleavened bread (Exod. xii. 15, etc.), so the Corinthian Christians ought to purge out the old leaven of sin, or the sinner, even as they are *by their profession* unleavened, i.e., holy and saintly, free from the leaven of sin (i. 2). To show the fitness whereof, he adds: "For our Pasch also was sacrificed (namely) Christ." Pasch is here evidently put for the Paschal victim, as in Luke xxii. 7. The Jews offered their Paschal sacrifices annually, and were bound to abstain from leaven only for a week, but Christians having only One Paschal Victim, who, "by one oblation hath perfected forever them that are sanctified" (Heb. x. 14), ought to keep a continual feast, and therefore abstain at all times from the leaven of sin. Hence the exhortation in verse 8 follows naturally.

8. "Therefore let us feast (*ἀπορώμεν*, 'keep our festival') not," etc. Most commentators, even of those who understand leaven in the preceding verses of the sinner, take it here of sin. But it is possible to understand it here too of the sinner, "in" being put for "with" (the Greek *ἐν* for *σύν*, after the manner of the Hebrew *בְּ*, e.g., Luke xiv. 31; Jude 14), so that the meaning would be: let us keep our festival not in the society of sinners who have fallen back into their former sins ("fermento veteri"), I mean (*ὑπὲρ* must be explanatory here, not disjunctive) not in the society of sinners of malice and wickedness, but in the society of those who are free from sin ("azymis") in sincerity and truth. It may well be, however, as Estius says, that the

veteri, neque in fermento malitiae et nequitiae: sed in azymis sinceritatis et veritatis.

^a Scripsi vobis in epistola:

with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

^a I wrote to you in an epistle,

Apostle speaks of the sinner as leaven in 6 and 7, and of sin under the same metaphor in the present verse: "Nihil vetat fermenti metaphora nunc hominem vitiosum, nunc ipsum vitium aut vitia significari." The verse would then mean: Let us keep our festival not in old leaven, I mean not in leaven of malice and wickedness, but in unleavened things of sincerity and truth; and this is more natural. The words "malice" (κακία) and "wickedness" (πονηρία), seem to differ in this that malice is simply sin, but wickedness is sin with hypocrisy or guile or fuller deliberation added. So Theoph.

It is probable that the use of this metaphor regarding the leaven was suggested to St. Paul by the fact that the festival of the Pasch was present or near when this letter was written. We know from iv. 19 that he intended to come to Corinth *shortly* after it was written, and from xvi. 8 that he meant to tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost; hence no very long time can have elapsed between the writing of this letter and Pentecost, and it is very likely that it was written about the Pasch. Indeed some understand verse 7 to mean: Be without leaven (metaphorically), as you are during these days without leaven (literally), and these hold that St. Paul wrote during the Paschal week.

9. "I wrote to you in an epistle (ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, 'in the epistle,' or, 'in my epistle') not to keep the society of (the rendering of our English version: 'not to keep company with,' might suggest a wrong meaning) fornicators." πόρνοι ("fornicators") means here probably all who were in any way unchaste.

But to what epistle does the Apostle refer—to the present or to an epistle now lost? The form of reference: Ἐγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, will not enable us to decide. For ἔγραψα might be used either in reference to the present epistle (ix. 15), or of course to a former epistle, and ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, though referring much more naturally to a former epistle than to what has been written a few lines before in this chapter, is yet not decisive (see Rom. xvi. 22; 1 Thess. v. 27; Col. iv. 16).^{*} But though the

^{*} It is worth noting, however, that in each of these instances the phrase occurs in what may be regarded as a postscript, so that the letter could be regarded as already written and naturally referred to by the aorist.

Ne commisceamini fornicariis ; not to keep company with fornicators. ¹⁰ Non utique fornicariis huius mundi, aut avaris, aut rapacibus, aut idolis servientibus : I mean not with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or the extortioners, or the servers of

form of the reference may not quite decide the question, there can be no reasonable doubt that the reference is to a former epistle, for what the Apostle says he wrote is certainly not contained in the preceding portion of the present epistle. The only part of the present epistle that he could possibly be understood to refer to, is the present chapter, *cc.* 1-8, but in 1-5 there is question only of one sinner and of his punishment, and in 6-8 there is no room for supposing that the Apostle made any reference to non-Christians, *i.e.*, there is no room for the misunderstanding which the Apostle now proceeds to remove. That St. Paul ordered the Corinthians to excommunicate the incestuous man, or that he announced his own determination to deliver him over to Satan, is a very different thing from what he here says he wrote to them : "not to keep the society of fornicators." Besides it would seem from 2 Cor. x. 10, that before that letter he had written to the Corinthians more than once.

Hence the admonition here referred to must have stood in an epistle that is now lost,* which was really the First Epistle to the Corinthians.

What he says, then, in the present verse is : I wrote to you in my epistle not to keep the society of those who are impure.

10. He explains that he did not mean to forbid social intercourse with sinners who were pagans, for such a prohibition would be quite impossible of observance. The sense is : not at all meaning (to refer to) the impure of this world (the unregenerate, pagan world, as opposed to the Church, *iii.* 19), or to the covetous and ("and," not "or," is the more probable reading) extortioners or the servers of idols ; for to do that you must needs leave the world. Since the Christians were comparatively few in Corinth and around, and since they were poor and often depended for a means of living on pagans, if all intercourse with pagan sinners were forbidden to them, they would need to leave the world altogether in order to be able to observe the prohibition. The wicked world they had already left in becoming

* The letter which the Corinthians had written to the Apostle before he wrote this present letter (*vii.* 1.) is also lost.

alioquin debueratis de hoc mundo exiisse. ¹¹ Nunc autem scripsi vobis non commisceri; si is qui frater nominatur est fornicator, aut avarus, aut idolis serviens, aut maledicus, aut ebriosus, aut rapax, cum eiusmodi nec cibum sumere.

idols: otherwise you must needs go out of this world. ¹¹ But now I have written to you, not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother, be a fornicator, or covetous or a server of idols, or a railer, or a drunkard, or an extortioner: with such an one not so much

Christians, but if the Apostle had forbidden all intercourse with pagan sinners, they might quit the earth, for the thing could not be done while they lived. Omit the "hoc" before "mundo" in the Vulgate. Three classes of sinners are mentioned in the verse: those who sinned against themselves (fornicators), those who sinned against the neighbour, whether by desire and guile or by open violence (covetous and extortioners), and those who sinned directly against God (servers of idols)—votaries respectively of impurity, greed, and superstition.

11. Passing from the negative to the positive explanation of what he had previously written, the Apostle says that he meant to forbid them to keep the society of sinners who were Christians.

But, as it is (seeing that I could not expect you to abstain from all society with pagan sinners), my meaning was, that you should not keep his society if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, etc.

"If any man that is named (or: 'that names himself,' professes to be) a brother, be a fornicator." This is the sense of the Vulgate and is a legitimate sense of the original. But the original may mean: "If any man that is a brother be a named (or notorious) fornicator." In the latter view, which is very probable, it is only those Christians who are publicly known to be sinners, who are to be avoided. And indeed St. Augustine, followed by Cornely, thinks it is only those who have been named (by their ecclesiastical superiors) as notorious sinners after a proper judicial investigation that are meant (St. Augustine, *Serm.* 351).

In addition to the sins mentioned in connection with non-Christians, Jews or Gentiles (10), he now mentions two others, namely, railing and drunkenness, perhaps because he had heard that these were committed by some of the Christians of Corinth. St. Chrysostom (on vi. 10) says that many in his time found fault with the Apostle for putting the "railer" (or "reviler") and "drunkard" in such company.

¹² Quid enim mihi de iis qui foris sunt, iudicare ? Nonne de iis qui intus sunt, vos iudicatis ? ¹³ Nam eos qui foris sunt, Deus iudicabit. Auferte malum ex vobis ipsis.

as to eat. ¹² For what have I to do to judge them that are without ? Do not you judge them that are within ? ¹³ For them that are without, God will judge. Put away the evil one from among yourselves.

It may seem strange that there should be mention of servers of idols here, where the Apostle is speaking of *Christian* sinners. But we may suppose that some of the Gentile converts, long accustomed to idol worship, sometimes joined in it, at least externally, after their conversion, through fear or human respect, while not intending to renounce Christianity.

12. He explains why he had not meant to speak of non-Christian sinners—it was no business nor even right of his to judge them—for not having been baptized they did not belong to the Church, and were not subject to the Church's jurisdiction. No doubt he could have punished even them indirectly by forbidding Christians to associate with them, but he has already said that this would have been to demand too much of Christians in the circumstances.

13. Yet those without shall not go unjudged, for God shall judge them. Instead of "nam eos" of the Vulgate, read "eos autem" (τοὺς ἑῶν).

Many authorities read the present κρινοὶ instead of the future κρινεῖ, and then the meaning would be : Do not you judge them that are within ; whereas them that are without God judgeth ? He concludes by ordering them to exercise their judicial authority upon the incestuous sinner : "Put away the evil one, the wicked one, from among yourselves." The form of the command recalls the words of Moses decreeing death against certain classes of sinners (Deut. xvii. 7 ; xix. 19 ; xxiv. 7, acc. to LXX).

The Apostle signifies clearly that his instruction in his former letter was a strictly judicial act, implying jurisdiction, the judgment of a legitimate superior speaking with authority. For it is only in such case that those outside the Church were beyond the reach of his judgment ; moreover the comparison with God's judgment shows that he speaks of a judgment in the strict sense.

We have here a very early reference to boycotting, but boycotting authorised by legitimate authority and for sufficient reason.

CHAPTER VI

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Apostle blames the Corinthian Christians for bringing their disputes before pagan tribunals (vv. 1-6), nay, for having disputes at all (7a), since the more perfect thing would be to forego their rights (7b); so far from doing this, however, they injure and defraud even their fellow-Christians (8). These sins of injustice and other grave sins shall exclude the sinner from the Kingdom of God (9-10). Christians have been freed from these sins and sanctified, and therefore ought not to relapse into them (11). Things indifferent in themselves are not always lawful (12). Fornication is a great crime in a Christian, because his body belongs to Christ (13), and is destined for a glorious resurrection (14), his members are the members of Christ, but fornication makes them members of a harlot (15-17), the fornicator sins in a special way against his own body (18), he defiles a temple of the Holy Ghost (19), and abuses what was purchased by the blood of Christ (20a). Christians, therefore, ought to glorify God in their bodies (20b).

<p>¹ AUDET aliquis vestrum habens negotium adversus alterum, iudicari apud iniquos,</p>	<p>¹ DARE any of you, having a matter against another, go to be judged before the unjust,</p>
--	--

From speaking of the Church's power of judging, the Apostle passes on to speak of another abuse which existed in the Church of Corinth. For not only were the Corinthians neglecting to exercise the authority which the Church possesses against sinners, but in regard to judgments of another kind their conduct was reprehensible. To understand what follows, it must be borne in mind that the Roman law, to which Corinth was subject at this time, permitted the Jews to have their disputes settled by their own tribunals, and, whether for Jews or Gentiles, gave its sanction to settlements effected privately. Hence for the settlement of Christian disputes it was not necessary to have recourse to heathen tribunals.

1. "Dare any of you?" etc. The very form of the question shows the grave impropriety of such conduct. It was unworthy, nay, absurd, for two Christians to look for justice at the tribunals of the unjust.

et non apud sanctos ? ¹ An nescitis quoniam sancti de hoc mundo iudicabunt ? Et in vobis iudicabitur mundus, indigni estis qui de minimis iudicetis ! ² Nescitis quoniam angelos iudicabimus ! quanto

and not before the saints ? ¹ Know you not that the saints shall judge this world ? And if the world shall be judged by you, are you unworthy to judge the smallest matters ? ² Know you not that we shall judge angels ! how much more

By the "unjust" he means unbelievers (c. 6) : "Hos enim quia fide carent, ex qua justus vivit, generaliter injustos appellat Apostolus" (Est.) ; and by the "saints" are meant Christians, who by vocation are all holy (i. 2) and therefore just. "Another" (τὸν ἑπὶ) is "the neighbour" who is a Christian, for an unbeliever would not abide by the decision of a Christian tribunal.

2. "Or (ἢ is to be read before οὐκ) know you not that the saints shall judge the world ?"—not merely the wicked world, which would be τὸν κακούρον τόντον (cf. v. 10), but the whole world, good and bad. From this he rightly concludes that they ought to be able to judge the small matters of everyday life. Instead of "unworthy to judge the smallest matters" the Greek has "unworthy of the lowest tribunals," but the sense is the same, for the lowest tribunals dealt with the smallest matters.

3. Still urging the dignity of Christians, and so the indignity of going to be judged before unbelievers, he says : "Know you not that we shall judge angels ? How much more things that pertain to this life !" Some think only the fallen angels are meant, but since the Apostle says "angels" without any restriction, and since it enhances the dignity of Christians if good angels also are meant, we prefer to understand of all angels, good and bad. Nor is it surprising that even the good angels shall be judged in the general judgment, for, as à Lapide says : "Una enim est ecclesia hominum et angelorum, unumque caput et iudex Christus, atque hoc etiam (that the angels should be judged) pertinet ad publicam gloriam divinae justitiae et ad laudem angelorum."

How the saints, the Christians who remain true to their vocation, shall judge the world, including even the good angels, is indeed a mystery. It is easy enough to see how in an improper sense they might be said to judge by their approving presence with Christ, and by contrast of their lives with the lives of the wicked, but this would not make them judges in the strict sense. And yet unless the Apostle be merely quibbling, it would seem

magis saecularia ? ⁴ Saecularia things of this world. ⁴ If there-
 igitur iudicia si habueritis : fore you have judgments of
 contemptibiles qui sunt in things pertaining to this world,
 ecclesia, illos constituite ad set them to judge who are the
 most despised in the church.

that they shall be judges in a strict sense on the day of judgment, for his argument is that because they shall be worthy to judge then, *a fortiori* they are worthy and able to judge now ; but this argument does not conclude unless in the first case as well as in the second there is question of a true, authoritative judgment.

It would seem then that the just shall really judge on the last day, Christ of course being the supreme Judge. How exactly this shall take place, we do not know ; but at all events the judgment of the just shall neither exclude, nor be independent of, the judgment of Him " who was appointed by God Judge of living and dead " (Acts x. 42). " Sanctorum iudicio iudicium Domini non tantum non excluditur, sed supponitur, siquidem unum idemque cum illo est. Christus est caput corporis mystici, cujus iusti omnes sunt membra ; atqui illud quod caput facit, membra quoque faciunt, non propria utique auctoritate, sed auctoritate capitis sui. . . . Quam sanctorum potestatem iudicariam, cujus fundamentum est eorum mystica unio cum Christo, cave ne mere denominativam esse putes, ut sit nomen sine re ; neque enim magis est mere denominativa aut analogica quam omnium hominum peccatum et mors in Adamo aut mors nostra mystica, qua vetus noster homo destruitur (Rom. vi. 6 sq.), vel nova vita, quam gratia sanctificante ornati in Christo degimus, vel futura nostra haereditas vel futurum nostrum regnum " (Corn.).

4. " Pertaining to this world " ; literally, " pertaining to this life." If you have cause for litigation, appoint as judges the despised, the lowest among your own body. This is the true sense of the words, though the Revised Version* and many Protestants, following Luther, take the verse interrogatively : " Do you set them to judge who are of no account in the Church ? " meaning, Do you set up as judges unbelievers ? But it was not the Christians who set up state tribunals, while if there were merely question of bringing cases before these tribunals, St. Paul would certainly have used some other expression than καθίζετε. Nor would he be likely to speak of pagans as " the despised in

* In its margin the R.V. gives our view.

iudicandum. * Ad verecundiam vestram dico. Sic non est inter vos sapiens quisquam, qui possit iudicare inter fratrem suum ?

* Sed frater cum fratre iudicio contendit : et hoc apud infideles ? † Iam quidem omnino delictum est in vobis, quod

* I speak to your shame. Is it so that there is not among you any one wise man, that is able to judge between his brethren ? † But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before unbelievers. † Already indeed there is plainly a fault among you, that you have

the Church." Hence the meaning undoubtedly is that which we have given : Set up as judges the least—the most ignorant—among you, rather than have recourse to heathen tribunals.

5. He explains what he has just said. He did not really mean that they should set up as judges the least in the Church, but he used such language in order to put them to shame. For if the judgment of the least of their brethren ought to be preferred to that of unbelievers, surely they ought to be ashamed if, having competent persons among themselves, they still have recourse to the judgment of unbelievers.

"Is it so that there is not among you one wise man, who shall be able to judge between his brethren ?" Ἐνί has the force of *inter*, of which older grammarians thought it a contracted form. But see Winer, *Gramm. of New Testament Greek*, § 14, p. 96. It is not certain whether we ought to read οὐδεὶς σοφός with B K C 17, Copt., or the more emphatic σοφός οὐδεὶς τις ; which is also strongly attested. We might naturally expect the plural τῶν ἀδελφῶν here instead of the strange τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ (literally "between his brother"); probably the phrase is a contracted formula in ordinary use for "between his brother and his brother" (Cf. Apoc. vii. 17 ; v. 6).

6. Two things are reprehended : first, that they should go to law with each other at all ; secondly, that they should do so before unbelievers, from whom they could not expect justice, and whom they would surely scandalize by their disputes. If this verse be read interrogatively the sense is not altered.

7. "Already indeed there is plainly (ὁρατός) a fault among you," or, as the Revised Version : "Nay already it is altogether a defect in you"—whatever the tribunal might be. The Greek word for "fault" means literally an inferiority, then, as here, a defect or fault. There is not question of sin, as it seems, but only of imperfection, for to submit meekly to injury without

judicia habetis inter vos. Quare non magis iniuriam accipitis ? quare non magis fraudem patimini ? * Sed vos iniuriam facitis, et fraudatis : et hoc fratribus.

* An nescitis quia iniqui regnum Dei non possidebunt ? Nolite errare : neque fornicarii, neque idolis servientes, neque

lawsuits one with another. Why do you not rather take wrong ? why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded ? * But you do wrong and defraud, and that to *your* brethren.

* Know you not that the unjust shall not possess the kingdom of God ? Do not err : Neither fornicators, nor idola-

seeking redress, and to allow oneself to be defrauded, is not commanded but only counselled. St. Chrysostom, Estius, and many others, however, think that the Apostle here declares the institution of legal proceedings to be ordinarily a sin : " Non quod id per se malum sit, sed quia malum non unum, sed multa fere conjuncta habet " (Est.). But Cornely remarks with reason : " Interpretes qui severam hanc interpretationem sequuntur, tot exceptiones, quibus litigantes a peccato excusentur, statuunt, ut eam erroneam esse satis manifestent."

In the words : " why do you not rather take (' bear with '—a middle sense) wrong ? Why do you not rather suffer yourselves to be defrauded ? " the wrong may be understood of injuries to the person or generally, while " defrauded " refers to injury in one's property.

8. But so far are you from fulfilling these counsels of perfection that *you yourselves wrong*, and defraud your fellow-Christians ; οὐκ ἔστι expressed for emphasis. Τοῦτο not ταῦτα, is the true reading.

9-10. Or (ἤ) do you not know, he proceeds, that those who sin against justice by wronging and defrauding their neighbours, shall not *inherit* the Kingdom of God ? The context makes it more probable that the ἀδικοὶ here are not the unrighteous generally, as the Revised Version understands, but those who sin against the virtue of justice. Then the Apostle proceeds, taking occasion from the mention of this one class of grave sin to refer to other sins which are mortal " genere suo " and exclude from heaven. The words : " do not err," seem to point to the presence in Corinth of some who taught or thought otherwise. Perhaps some of them had inferred, or pretended to infer, from St. Paul's doctrine about the liberty of Christians, that they were no longer bound by any law. Writing to the Galatians the Apostle tells them : " For you, brethren, have been called into liberty,

adulteri, ¹⁰ Neque molles, neque masculorum concubitores, neque fures, neque avari, neque ebriosi, neque maledici, neque rapaces, regnum Dei possidebunt. ¹¹ Et hæc quidam fuistis : sed abluti estis, sed sanctificati estis, sed iustificati

ters, nor adulterers, ¹⁰ Nor the effeminate, nor liers with mankind, nor thieves, nor covetous, nor drunkards, nor railers, nor extortioners shall possess the kingdom of God. ¹¹ And such some of you were : but you are washed, but you are sanctified,

only make not liberty an occasion to the flesh " (Gal. v. 13). He now proceeds to mention various classes of sinners who shall be excluded from heaven. " Fornicators " (πόρνοι) distinguished here from adulterers (μοιχοί), and from those guilty of unnatural sins (whether passively, ὁμοερωτοί, or actively ἀρσενοκοίται) is to be understood of those who are fornicators in the strict sense. Some think that " idolaters," standing here between fornicators and adulterers, is to be understood of those who sinned with the harlots at the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth. But this is forced and unnatural. Rather the Apostle seems to follow no order in the enumeration of the sins, for he mentions drunkards* and railers (or revilers) between covetous and extortioners in the next verse. Hence we prefer to understand idolaters in the ordinary sense, of those who worshipped as God something else than God.

11. " Such some of you were." Not all of them had been guilty of such crimes. We may believe that some devout Jews, and even Gentiles, had kept themselves free from grave sins before they became Christians.

" But you are washed." The Greek middle means : you caused yourselves to be washed (so in Acts xxii. 16 : " Arise and get baptized, and have your sins washed away "). The reference is to baptism, and the middle voice implies their good dispositions, their desire to receive the Sacrament, the effect of which was to wash out their sins. The two verbs that follow are in the passive voice, to indicate that the effects of the Sacrament were entirely from God, not from themselves. The washing and sanctification and justification present the effects of Baptism under different aspects, the removal of sin, the clothing in grace, and the constituting of the sinner really just before God. The verse refutes the Protestant theory that sins are merely covered over, or not

* Estius holds that μέθυσθαι may be used of a man only once drunk, and that both it and the Latin " ebrius " are used of one in whom reason is clouded, though not extinguished. Cf. Estius on v. 11.

estis, in nomine Domini nostri
IESU CHRISTI, et in spiritu Dei
nostri.

¹² Omnia mihi licent, sed non
omnia expediunt. Omnia mihi

but you are justified in the name
of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, and
the spirit of our God.

¹² All things are lawful to
me, but all things are not ex-

attended to by God in view of the merits of Christ, for it implies that the sins of the Corinthians were washed away and that they themselves were made really holy and just. See Council of Trent, Sess. vi., Cap. vii, and Can. xi.

"In the name," etc. This glorious change wrought in the Corinthians, took place through the merits of Christ, and through the Holy Ghost who proceeds from the Father, and who was poured out in their hearts (Rom. v. 5). Christ was the meritorious cause, and by appropriation the Holy Ghost is spoken of as the efficient cause, though in reality the efficient cause was the whole Blessed Trinity.

St. Thomas refers "the Spirit of our God" to the Divinity of Christ, the preceding clause to His humanity, but the interpretation just set forth seems much more probable.

12. There is great difference of opinion as to the connection and drift of this verse. We consider wholly improbable the view of those who hold that the Apostle begins in this verse to treat of the eating of meats offered to idols, then digresses in the next verse, only to return to the subject in chapter viii. Also the view of those who hold that he begins to treat of his right to receive support from the Corinthians, but digresses in v. 13, only to return to the subject in chapter ix. A more probable view is that he is adding something to what he said in verse 7 regarding lawsuits that were *per se* just. As if he said, I do not mean that such lawsuits are in themselves wrong, but I do say, considering the circumstances of us Christians and the dangers of anger, railing, etc., etc., connected with all lawsuits, they are not expedient; again, I do not say they are wrong, but there is danger that through them I may become a slave to strife and ill-feeling or to attachment to some earthly goods, "brought under the power of any (thing)." We consider this view not improbable, for though Cornely and others think it is clear that the question of lawsuits ends with verse 8, it is by no means clear. In the end of verse 7 the Apostle says: Why do you not rather bear to be defrauded? Instead of that, he continues, you yourselves defraud (8), apparently forgetting that those who are guilty of

licent, sed ego sub nullius redigar potestate. ¹² Eaca ventri, et venter escis : Deus autem et hunc, et has destruet : corpus

pedient. All things are lawful to me, but I will not be brought under the power of any. ¹² Meat for the belly, and the belly for the meats : but God shall de-

injustice and of other grave sins, which some of you formerly committed, shall not inherit the kingdom of God (9-11). Hence verses 8-11 may be regarded as arising out of the thought of verse 7, and the Apostle could continue naturally in verse 12 the subject of verse 7.

However this may be, the more common opinion connects verse 12 with what follows, and holds that the Apostle here commences to treat of fornication. In this view it is supposed, and indeed justly, that in the pagan world fornication, like eating or drinking, was numbered among natural and indifferent acts. Moreover, St. Paul's doctrine regarding the liberty of the sons of God (see *e.g.*, Gal. v. 13, 23), may have been seized upon by some in Corinth to show that they were subject to no law and could do as they wished. Accordingly St. Paul takes up the maxim : " All things are lawful to me," which was possibly used by himself at Corinth in references to things forbidden by the ceremonial part of the Mosaic Law, and explains that it is to be qualified even when there is question of things that are indifferent. Then he goes on to show that in reality fornication is not to be numbered among things indifferent.

" All things are lawful to me." That is, all indifferent things are lawful, absolutely speaking ; but all are not expedient (or profitable, in a moral sense, *οὐκ ἐπιτρεπόμενα*) ; nay, in certain cases, the use of things indifferent would end in making me their slave. Thus in the case of drink, to touch it may be wrong for the man who cannot use it moderately but becomes a slave to it. Hence the Apostle says : " I will not be brought under the power of any (thing)." So that what is, absolutely speaking, lawful, may not be expedient, and may not be even permissible to me. Having thus indicated that the maxim : " All things are lawful " must be qualified even in regard to things in themselves indifferent, the Apostle proceeds to show that fornication is not an indifferent thing.

13. In doing so, he alludes to what might be, and perhaps was, advanced as an argument for fornication, namely, that it was as natural for the body, as the reception and digestion of food for

autem non fornicationi, sed Domino : et Dominus corpori.
 14 Deus vero et Dominum suscitavit : et nos suscitabit per

stroy both it and them : but the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body. 14 Now God hath both raised up the Lord, and

the stomach, and he points out that there is no parity. " Meats " (*τὰ βρώματα*) are destined by God for the belly, and the belly for meats to receive and digest them, but God shall bring to naught (as to their present uses) both it and them. that is both meats and the belly shall not exist in the next life for their present uses. Hence since the stomach is evidently destined for the digestion of food and support of the body; and since it shall not discharge this function in the next life, for as the blessed shall " neither marry nor be given in marriage " (Mark xii. 25 ; Luke xx. 35), so they shall neither eat nor drink, it follows that it is quite natural and lawful to take food. But the body is not destined for fornication as the stomach for food, but it is destined to be the servant of the soul, and through and with it of Jesus Christ, and Christ is destined for the body to be its Head, to make it, and to have it as, His member here (v. 15), and to transform it into the likeness of His glorified body hereafter (Phil. iii. 21).

14. And this destination of the body, unlike that of the stomach, shall be perpetual, for " God both raised up the Lord and will raise up us by His power," and in that risen state the body will still belong to Jesus Christ. So that in taking food into the stomach we merely use the stomach for its natural end, and that an end that can be attained only now on earth, whereas in fornication the body is turned away from Him who is its end, a thing which is eternal is turned away from Him who is its end both here and hereafter. Hence fornication is not, like the taking of food, an indifferent act.

It is to be noted that the Apostle does not contrast the organs of generation, but the whole body, with the stomach, though even these organs are not destined for indiscriminate intercourse but only for lawful use in matrimony, just as the stomach is not destined for gluttony but only for the moderate use of food. " Unde," says St. Thomas on v. 13, "*nec ipsa membra sunt propter fornicationem, sed propter usum generationis ordinata ratione, cui omnia membra corporis deservire debent : sicut etiam venter non propter crapulam et ebrietatem, sed propter convenientem usum ciborum.*"

virtutem suam. ¹³ Nescitis quoniam corpora vestra membra sunt Christi ! Tollens ergo membra Christi, faciam membra meretricis ? Absit. ¹⁴ An nescitis quoniam qui adhaeret meretrici, unum corpus efficitur ? Erunt enim (inquit)

will raise us up also by His power. ¹³ Know you not that your bodies are the members of Christ ! Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot ? God forbid. ¹⁴ Or know you not that he who is joined to a harlot is made one body ? For

15. Having shown that fornication is not an indifferent act, the Apostle now proceeds to prove its heinousness in a Christian. His first argument is, that the Christian who commits this sin makes the members of Christ the members of a harlot. The argument supposes a *real* union between the bodies of Christians and Christ, and though we do not understand this any more than we do other mysteries, yet the argument here, and the Apostle's language in other passages (e.g. Eph., v. 30 : " Because we are members of His body, of His flesh and of His bones " ; see also xii. 27), forbid us to doubt the fact.

Estius holds that this verse proves that there are sinners in the Church, for he contends that the Apostle speaks of fornicators as *at the same time* members of Christ and of a harlot. But this is at best an uncertain argument for a doctrine that is certain. The Apostle's words might mean : " having taken away (ἀρῶν) what were the members of Christ, shall I make them the members of a harlot ? " and that such is not their meaning cannot be proved from this passage, but must be learned from other parts of Scripture.

16. In the preceding verse the Apostle has supposed that the bodies of fornicators become the members of a harlot. He now proves this.

" Or know you not (ἢ οὐκ οἴσθε) that he who is joined to (Vet. It. : ' qui agglutinatur ') a harlot is one body (with her) ? " And this he proves by quoting Gen. ii. 24 : " For the two, saith he, shall be unto one flesh," or : " shall become one flesh." These words were spoken by Adam, but as the Council of Trent (*Sess. xxiv. Doctr. de Sac. Matrim.*) says, " divini Spiritus instinctu " ; and hence our Lord (Matt. xix. 4) attributes them to God, as probably St. Paul also does here.

As in the case of husband and wife, the use of marriage makes them one flesh, so, too, in fornication. " Per mixtionem carnalem

duo in carne una. ¹⁷ Qui autem *they shall be, saith he, two in*
 adhaeret Domino, unus spiritus *one flesh.* ¹⁷ But he who is
 est. ¹⁸ Fugite fornicationem. ¹⁸ Fly fornication. Every sin

una caro efficiuntur, et sic membra unius fiunt membra alterius. Sunt enim haec verba Adae de viro et uxore loquentis, quae Apostolus hic etiam ad fornicationem refert, quia secundum speciem naturae non differunt utriusque actus." St. Thomas on this verse.

For a very different explanation of the verse see Cornely.*

17. The sense of these words is clear enough, namely, that he who is closely united to Christ (by faith and charity) is one spirit with Him; his whole spiritual being is merged, as it were, in Christ. But the bearing of the statement in the present context is not by any means clear. Perhaps, as verse 16 proves that the members of fornicators become the members of a harlot, the present verse is intended to point out that the bodies of Christians are the members of Christ, the close spiritual union of Christians with Christ implying also the union of their bodies with Him, inasmuch as the body is the servant of the spirit. Such seems to be the view of St. Thomas, who writes on this verse: "Et quia corpus deservit spiritui, consequens est ut etiam corpora nostra membra ejus sint cui per spiritum unimur, non quidem carnali conjunctione, sed spirituali."

18. "Fly fornication." The verb may have been specially chosen, as most of the Fathers and commentators suggest, to signify that in regard to this vice in particular victory is to be sought not in standing and resisting, but in flying from the occasion. But see x. 14 and 1 Tim. vi. 11.

"Every sin that a man doth," etc. There is great variety of

* The substance of Cornely's view is that the words "the two shall be one flesh" are true of husband and wife at all times, even if the marriage never be consummated, and not merely during the use of marriage ("therefore they are no longer two, but one flesh," Matt. xix. 6). Hence, he argues, this permanent union of bodies arises through a moral union—a union of their minds. "quae mutuam corporum traditionem respicit." And the union of the bodies of fornicators is founded upon a somewhat similar union of minds. "Quia corpus nostrum spiritui nostro deservit, consequens est, ut etiam corpora nostra sint membra ejus cui per spiritum unimur, ac proin revera Christianus fornicans membra Christo aufert ut ea meretrici tradat." It is in favour of this view that St. Paul uses *συνήμωροι* in the next verse of a moral union, also that he does not say in the present verse that he who is joined to a harlot becomes one body with her, but that he *is* (or *is made*) one body (though our Rhemish version, following the Vulg. "unum corpus efficiatur," has "is made one body").

Omne peccatum, quodcumque fecerit homo, extra corpus est : qui autem fornicatur, in corpus

that a man doth is without the body : but he that committeth fornication, sinneth against his

opinion regarding the meaning of these words, and no view is altogether satisfactory. It is clear enough from the whole context that the Apostle intends to ascribe to fornication some special injury or dishonour to the body, but the precise meaning of his words is a puzzle. First, we may remark, with St. Augustine (Serm. 162, 1), that in one sense no sin is without, or outside (ἐκτός) the body, for as long as body and soul are united, the soul in all its acts requires the intervention of a corporal organ. Thus even in spiritual sins, such as pride or envy, the brain is brought into play. In this sense, then, no sin is "without the body." Secondly, much will depend upon whether we understand "every sin" to mean every sin whatsoever, including fornication, or every other sin except fornication (cf. Matt. xii. 31). Thirdly, much will also depend upon whether εἰς τὸ ἴδιον σῶμα is in antithesis to ἐκτός τοῦ σώματος.

Of the many views that have been advanced, some may be set aside at once. Thus some take body to mean wife (cf. Eph. v. 28), and explain : No other sin is so directly against the wife as fornication is. But plainly the body spoken of here is that of the fornicator (vv. 13, 15); moreover this view would make the Apostle refer only to those sinners who were married, whereas probably most of those who sinned with harlots were unmarried.

Equally improbable is the view of those who explain the text of spiritual fornication, i.e., of a turning away from God to go after the things of the world, for the whole context shows that fornication cannot be taken in that sense here.

Others with more probability take the meaning to be : most sins which men ordinarily commit are not sins against the body, but the fornicator pollutes, and weakens, and dishonours his body, and excites it with an all-absorbing lust. If it be objected that much the same is true of the sinner guilty of suicide, self-mutilation, or drunkenness, à Lapide, who adopts this view, replies that as suicide and self-mutilation are uncommon, they are not contemplated, while gluttony may be regarded as included in fornication because so often leading to it. But against this view is the fact that the Apostle does not say : most sins are without the body, but every sin (πάντα . . . ὁ λόγος). Moreover, it is

suum peccat. ¹⁸ An nescitis own body. ¹⁹ Or know you not quoniam membra vestra tem- that your members are the plum sunt Spiritus sancti qui temple of the Holy Ghost, who in vobis est, quem habetis a is in you, whom you have from

most unlikely that drunkenness is included in fornication ; the Apostle usually distinguishes them as in 9, 10 ; v. 11, etc.

Others thus : in every other sin a man tends towards something outside his body : the drunkard to drink, the avaricious to wealth, etc., so that he can be said to *sin against these* in desiring to wrest them from their proper end ; but the fornicator tends to nothing outside himself, but uses and abuses only his own body. If it be objected that the fornicator tends to the partner in sin, Cornely, who holds this view, replies that the Apostle has anticipated this objection by declaring (v. 16) that the harlot is *one body* with the fornicator. Most people, we fancy, will find this unnatural and over-subtle.

Others thus : every sin whatsoever, fornication included, is *external* to the body, i.e., the root and malice of every sin is not in the body, but in the soul (Mark viii. 18-23) ; but the fornicator sins against his own body. This view alone gives ἐκτός its natural meaning, but it takes no account of the seeming antithesis.

Others thus : Every other sin, except fornication (and the other sins of lust), is *comparatively* without the body, i.e., *not against* the honour and welfare of the body, but the fornicator in a very special way dishonours and offends against his own body. The obvious objection to this view is that the Apostle does not say every other sin is *comparatively* without the body, but simply without it. Besides, there is the same difficulty as above in regard to suicide, self-mutilation, and drunkenness. Yet it seems probable that it is on the lines of this last view or of the preceding that the verse is to be explained.

19. " Or know you not that your members are (Gr. : ' your body is ') a temple (not : *the* temple) of the Holy Ghost ? " The words : " or know you not," seem to show that the argument is continued from the preceding verse. The fornicator sins in some special way against his own body (18) ; but the body of a Christian is a temple of the Holy Ghost ; therefore a Christian who commits this sin is guilty of a kind of sacrilege. As usual, the Apostle leaves the conclusion to be supplied.

" Who is in you." The Holy Ghost is in the souls of the just

Deo, et non estis vestri?
 20 Empti enim estis pretio
 magno. Glorificate et portate
 Deum in corpore vestro.

God; and you are not your
 own? ²⁰ For you are bought
 with a great price. Glorify and
 bear God in your body.

not only by His grace but also by a personal presence, and with Him also the Father and Son. (See my Notes on The Gospel of St. John, vii. 39.) And since the soul is in the body, the body may well be said to be a temple of the Holy Ghost. The bodies of the just are also sanctified by the Holy Ghost, that they may be the fitting instruments of the sanctified soul.—“Whom you have from God”; *cō* is for *ō*, being attracted into the case of the antecedent. This clause shows they are not to attribute this honour to themselves.

20. “And you are not your own.” We would read these words with the next verse: And you are not your own, *for* (*γάρ*) you are (rather: “were”) bought with a great price. “Great” is not represented in the original but it gives the sense, for the price is the blood of Christ (Acts xx. 28; 1 Pet. i. 18, 19). We have thus another argument against abusing the body in fornication, for we were bought, both body and soul, by Christ, and belong to Him.

“Glorify and bear God in your body.” So the Vulgate. But the true reading seems to be: “Glorify, therefore (*ὅτι*) God in your body”—inserting “therefore” and omitting “and bear.” So B K A C D E F G, Copt., Arm., etc.

Since the dignity of the body is so great, not merely shun fornication and avoid all evil works, but give yourselves to good works, and thus God shall be glorified: “So let your light shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father who is in heaven” (Matt. v. 16).

CHAPTER VII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

In reply to questions put by the Corinthians, the Apostle treats of the use of Marriage (vv. 1-7), then expresses his preference of virginity, while approving of Marriage (8-9). Next he discusses the firmness of the Marriage bond, first in a Christian Marriage (10-11), then in a mixed one (12-16). In connection with the dissolubility of mixed marriages, he goes on to point out that in general previous obligations are not affected or altered by a man's conversion to Christianity (17-24). Next he commends virginity (25-28), and sets forth the reason for the commendation (29-35). Lastly he gives some practical directions to parents in regard to their daughters (36-38), and ends with a short section regarding widows (39-40).

¹ DE quibus autem scripsistis mihi : Bonum est homini mulie- ¹ Now concerning the things whereof you wrote to me : It

A new section of the Epistle begins here, in which the Apostle discusses various questions put to him by the Corinthians in their letter. In this section (vii. 1-xv. 58) he discusses marriage and celibacy, the eating of meats offered to idols, the order to be observed in their liturgical assemblies, the subject of charisms, and finally the question of the resurrection of the body.

1. "Now concerning the things whereof you wrote to me." This is an introduction to the whole section. The letter of the Corinthians to which the Apostle here refers is lost, and must have been lost at a very early period. He proceeds at once to speak of the use of matrimony by Christians, this evidently being one of the questions about which they had consulted him.

"It is good for a man not to touch a woman." These words are indeed true in every case, whether the woman be the man's wife or not, but seeing that the Apostle has given such strong reasons against fornication in the preceding chapter, it is very unlikely that the present mild statement includes the proposition : It is good for a man not to touch a harlot. And if it does not include it, then the meaning must be : It is good for a man to

rem non tangere : ¹ Propter fornicationem autem unusquisque suam uxorem habeat, et unaquaeque suum virum habeat

is good for a man not to touch a woman. ² But for fear of fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband.

abstain from *lawful* carnal intercourse with a woman, *i.e.*, it is good for a man not to touch his wife. Everywhere else in the chapter γυνή means wife. "To touch" (ἀπτεσθαι) refers, as we have indicated, to carnal intercourse, as often in profane writers and in Scripture (See *e.g.* Gen. xx. 4, 6 ; xxvi. 11 ; Prov. vi. 29).

This abstinence from intercourse is declared to be good, not because all intercourse is bad (see verse 3), but because abstinence is the better, the more perfect thing. Καλός often bears this comparative sense. Thus at the marriage feast of Cana the chief steward says : " But thou hast kept the good (καλόν) wine until now," not meaning that the other wines were actually bad, but that the last was really fine and better. See also Matt. xviii. 8 ; xxvi. 24, etc.

2. " But for fear of fornication (Gr. : ' on account of fornications ') let every man," etc.

Most Protestants find here a precept commanding all to marry, a precept which, they say, is violated by the celibacy of priests and nuns. Many Catholics, too, among them St. Thomas, interpret this verse to mean : On account of the danger of fornication let everyone get married. But then these Catholics, it must be remembered, do not regard the words as containing a precept. They understand them to be explained by verse 6 : " but I speak this by indulgence, not by commandment," and to be meant for those who felt that they had not the gift of continency (7), and who had not already freely embraced celibacy (1 Tim. v. 12). Even in this view, therefore, the verse is not opposed to the celibacy of those, who hoping and believing that they have the gift from God, freely embrace celibacy.

But it is more probable that the Apostle is speaking in this verse not of contracting marriage, but of using marriage already contracted, discharging its duties, and exercising its privileges. St. Chrysostom says that the question put to the Apostle by the Corinthians was : whether it was necessary for a Christian man to abstain from his wife, and the Apostle's reply, he says, was : " If you ask me what is good and very excellent, then I say it is better to have no intercourse with a woman ; but if you ask

³ Uxori vir debitum reddat :
similiter autem et uxor viro.

⁴ Mulier sui corporis potestatem
non habet, sed vir. Similiter
autem et vir sui corporis potes-
tatem non habet, sed mulier.

⁵ Nolite fraudare invicem, nisi
forte ex consensu ad tempus, ut
vacetis orationi : et iterum re-
vertimini in idipsum, ne tentet

³ Let the husband render the
debt to his wife : and the wife
also in like manner to the
husband. ⁴ The wife hath not
power of her own body ; but
the husband. And in like
manner the husband also hath
not power of his own body ;
but the wife. ⁴ Defraud not
one another, except, perhaps
by consent, for a time, that
you may give yourselves to

what is safe and helpful to your weakness, then I say, use matrimony." This seems to us the true meaning of the passage. To " have a wife " (*γυναῖκα ἔχειν*) is nowhere else in all Scripture used of *taking* a wife, and if the Apostle had meant to speak of taking a wife he would have said : let each one get married, and not let each one *have* his own wife. " His own " implies that she was his wife already, and " have," that he should keep her and live with her.

" Fornications." The plural, which is the more probable reading, is used in reference to the various sins of impurity ; fornication, self-abuse, etc., to which a man abstaining from his wife would be liable.

3. Verse 2, as we have seen, prescribes the use of matrimony to each of the married parties on account of the danger of sin to themselves in case they abstained. Verse 3 now adds that each must use it at the will of the other, and thus render what is *due* in virtue of the marriage contract. *Τὴν ὀφειλὴν* proves what is proved also by verse 5, that there is question of a debt due in strict justice.

4. This verse gives the reason for the obligation to discharge the debt.

5. " Defraud not one another," or rather, as in Westminster Version, " deprive not one another (of your due)." From this too we learn that there is question of strict justice (cf. 7, 8 ; Mark x. 19). " Defraud," though the rendering of the Authorised and Revised Versions, as well as of the Rhemish, is incorrect, because then the exception appears to be an exception in favour of fraud in a certain case.

Yet though there is ordinarily this obligation to discharge the " debitum conjugale," the parties may lawfully abstain by

vos Satanas propter incontinentiam vestram. 'Hoc autem dico secundum indulgentiam, prayer: and return together again, lest Satan tempt you for your incontinency. 'But I

mutual consent for a time in order to give themselves in a special manner to prayer. Even this temporary abstinence is not *commanded*, and is not even contemplated except for reasons of special devotion (ἵνα σχολάσῃτε, that you may *devote* yourselves to prayer, not merely that you may pray).

"And return together again," or as the more probable reading has it: "and may be together again." The reference is to a return to conjugal intercourse.

"Lest Satan tempt you for (because of) your incontinency." These words may be connected either with what immediately precedes: "and may be together again," or with the opening words of the verse: "defraud ('deprive') not one another." Abstinence from lawful intercourse would be likely to give Satan an opportunity to tempt them. Διὰ with the accusative here can hardly mean: *through* your incontinency, which would require the genitive, but must be taken in its usual sense: "because of," or "on account of" your incontinency. The words may then be connected with "be together again," to give a second reason. Not only temptations suggested by the devil, but their own concupiscence required this. So Estius, and the Greeks generally. Or they may be connected, and perhaps more naturally, with tempt: "lest the devil tempt you because of your incontinency."

6. There is considerable difference of opinion regarding the reference in the word "this." As we said in verse 2, those Catholics who hold that verses 1, 2 regard *entrance* into the married state, take the present verse as covering what is there said, and explaining that marriage is not commanded.

But the true reference of "this" seems to be to verse 5. The substance of that verse is that husband and wife ought to cohabit unless by *mutual consent*, for *special and higher reasons*, they agree to abstain *for a time*, but that when that time is past they ought to cohabit again.

Hence lest it should be inferred that they could not by mutual consent abstain permanently, the Apostle now adds, that in speaking of a merely temporary abstinence and in laying down that they ought ordinarily to cohabit, he is speaking by indulgence not by commandment. In this view, "this" is naturally referred to what has been said last, and the sense is clear and

non secundum imperium. speak this by indulgence, not
 'Volo enim omnes vos esse by commandment. 'For I
 sicut meipsum : sed unusquis- would that all men were even

in accordance with the whole context. He who has declared that "it is good for a man not to touch a woman" (v. 1), who would wish that all men were even as himself (v. 7) who prescribes the use of matrimony only when there is danger otherwise of impurity (v. 2), cannot be supposed to censure permanent abstinence from conjugal intercourse, provided it be by mutual consent, and provided also there be no danger of sin. Hence in forbidding abstinence except for a time, he wishes not to be understood as imposing a precept, but rather as indulging the infirmity of human nature, and suggesting what in most cases is most prudent and most agreeable to human weakness.

7. "For I would that all men were even as myself." The reading is not certain. If "for" (γάρ) be the true reading, the connection with the preceding is clear : I impose no precept, for in reality I would wish all men to be like myself.

If the true reading be θέλω δέ, "yet (or 'but'), I wish," then the connection with verse 6 is : I permit you to resume the use of matrimony, yet I would that all men, etc.

"That all men ('vos,' of Vulg. is spurious) were even as myself." It is the common opinion of the FF., St. Clem. of Alex. (see Euseb., H. E. iii. 30) and St. Ign. (*Ad Philad.* 4) alone excepted, that St. Paul was never married. And of course he was free from all illicit intercourse. Hence the meaning of the words before us is : I would that all men abstained from all intercourse with women even as I do. But it is asked how could the Apostle wish this, since as St. Thomas puts it : "Si omnes homines continerent sicut Apostolus continebat, cessaret generatio et non impleretur numerus electorum, quod est contra dispositionem divinam." Some sought a way out of the difficulty by reading "vos" as in the Vulgate, and restricting the wish to the Corinthians. Others reply that the Apostle's "volo" (θέλω) does not express a wish but a velleity—I would wish if it were possible ; so Estius. Others, as St. Thomas, that the Apostle wished this "voluntate antecedente," i.e., abstracting from the present order of things. Others, as Cornely, hold that the Apostle expresses a real wish though he knows that it cannot be realised. But this seems to us not without difficulty. For since God does not wish all men to be celibates, "for each one has his own gift from God," it is

que proprium donum habet as myself : but every one hath
ex Deo : alius quidem sic, alius his proper gift from God ; one
after this manner, and another

not easy to see how St. Paul could truly wish what is opposed to God's wish. And it is clear that St. Paul realises that it is not God's will that all should be celibates, for the words : " but each one hath his proper (own) gift from God ; one after this manner, and another after that," mean that some have received from God the natural temperament and graces that enable them to lead the life of celibates, while others have received the natural temperament and graces that accord with the married state ; in other words, some have a vocation to a life of celibacy, some have not.

It is worthy of note that the Apostle regards aptitude for the married state as a gift from God, from which it follows that the married state is divinely appointed and good, though as this whole chapter shows (vv. 7, 8, 32-35, 38) less excellent than the state of celibacy.

Of course God's " gift," whether to the celibate or the married, is not such as to require no co-operation on their part ; as in regard to God's graces generally, man's co-operation is required. Nor is it such, consequently, as to exclude merit in those who live up to their calling.

It follows from the verse that all are not called to the state of celibacy, and have not the " gift " of celibacy. Yet if anyone has taken a vow of celibacy he cannot afterwards excuse himself by saying, as did some monks and nuns at the time of the Reformation, that he feels he has not this gift, for though he may not have the special aptitude for his state implied in the gift, and may therefore have greater difficulty in discharging his obligations, yet the absence of the " gift " does not imply that he is absolutely without the power to discharge his obligations. We have the promise of Christ that whatsoever we ask is granted to us (John xiv. 13, 14 ; xv. 16), and hence anyone who unhappily finds himself in the circumstances contemplated, must only pray more assiduously and more earnestly to the end that though wanting the special call which would make his state easy, he may at least obtain the graces which make the discharge of its obligations possible. This was clearly the view of St. Paul himself, for speaking of widows who had taken a vow not to remarry, he says that some of them desiring to marry again

vero sic. * Dico autem non after that. * But I say to the nuptis et viduis : bonum est unmarried, and to the widows : illis si sic permaneant, sicut et it is good for them if they so

" have damnation because they have made void their first faith " (1 Tim. v. 11, 12). Plainly he would not accept the excuse that they felt they were not called to lead a single life.

8. " Non nuptis " of the Vulgate is misleading, as the Latin verb " nubere " is properly used only of the female sex, whereas the Apostle wrote τοῖς ἀγάμοις, using the masculine article. Literally the Greek means " to those not married," and this whether they were ever previously married or not. Some think that because the unmarried, or "inconjugati," are here joined with widows that not all the unmarried men but only widowers are meant, so that the Apostle in this and the following verse should be understood to address himself to widowers and widows. In favour of this view it is argued that the Apostle begins only in verse 25 to speak of those never married, also that as the Greek language did not use the masculine ἄρσος for widowers, the Apostle naturally used the general term τοῖς ἀγάμοις in a restricted sense, indicating the restriction by mentioning widows immediately after.

But since the common opinion of the Fathers is that St. Paul was never married, and since if we held that only widowers and widows are here addressed, it would seem to follow from this verse : " it is good for them if they so continue even as I," that St. Paul was a widower, it seems more probable that the Apostle addresses all who are unmarried, whether never married or widowed. As to the arguments for the other view, it is true that the Apostle returns to, or rather *formally* takes up in verse 25, the subject of those never married ; but then he also returns to the subject of the widowed in 39. The fact seems to be that what he touches here casually in vv. 8, 9, in regard to both classes, he afterwards explains separately in regard to each.

Nor is there any sufficient reason for restricting the meaning of τοῖς ἀγάμοις. In its proper signification it includes all who are without marriage (ἄ and γάμος), whether men or women,* never married or widowed, and the only reason for not taking it in this sense here, is that widows who would be included in that

* If both were meant to be included, the masc. article τῶν as of the more worthy gender, would of course be used.

ego. ⁹ Quod si non se continent, nubant. Melius est enim nubere, quam uri.

¹⁰ Iis autem qui matrimonio iuncti sunt, praeceptum non ego, sed Dominus, uxorem a viro

continue, even as I. ⁹ But if they do not contain themselves, let them marry. For it is better to marry than to be burnt.

¹⁰ But to them that are married, not I, but the Lord

general sense, are mentioned separately. But they may be mentioned separately because the Apostle wished to emphasise the fact that even in their case, who are sometimes very anxious to remarry and often have strong reason for doing so on account of their desolate condition, it was the *better* thing to remain single.*

We take it then that the Apostle addresses all who are unmarried and especially widows. He tells them that it is good (see v. 2) for them, an excellent and more perfect thing, to remain single, even as he himself was; but if they feel that they have not the gift of celibate chastity,† then let them marry ("matrimonium ineant" instead of "nubant").

9. "For it is better to marry than to be burnt," i.e., than to be burnt by the fire of concupiscence. "Concupiscentia enim est calor quidam noxius: qui ergo concupiscentia impugnatur calescit quidem, sed non uritur, nisi humorem gratiae perdat a concupiscentia superatus." (St. Thomas). "To marry" and "to be burnt" are not compared as a lesser and a greater evil, but as a lesser good (than celibacy) and an evil. "Melius est ergo, i.e., magis tolerandum," says St. Thomas, "quod homo minus bonum habeat quam quod incurrat incontinentiae malum."

That the present clause affords no justification for marriage in those already bound by a vow, see 1 Tim. v. 12. As Estius remarks, the very marriage of such means that they are already overcome by concupiscence. For such there are other remedies than marriage, especially prayer. See above on verse 7.

10-11. The Apostle now proceeds to remind the Corinthians of Christ's teaching wherein He forbade "divortium a toro," and declared "divortium a vinculo" to be impossible. The Apostle is speaking of Christian marriages, for he is writing to Christians.

* For this special mention for emphasis of what is already included in a general statement, see Mark xvi. 7; "Tell his disciples and Peter," i.e., and especially Peter. Cf. ix. 5; Acts i. 14, etc.

† "Negatio cōx (pro. u) ita est adhibita, ut cum verbo ad unam ideam ex- si se dono continentiae carere sentiunt" (Corn.).

non discedere : ¹¹ Quod si discesserit, manere innuptam, aut viro suo reconciliari. Et vir ¹¹ commandeth, that the wife depart not from her husband. ¹¹ And if she depart, that she

and probably answering a question they had put him. Some of the Corinthian neophytes may, for instance, have thought that it was lawful and commendable for piety's sake to separate from the partner even against her or his will. Others may have had doubts as to whether they could not in some cases get rid of their partner and contract a new marriage, as had been so easy for those of them who were Jews while they remained in Judaism. To Christians then and of Christian marriages the Apostle is here writing. It is true indeed that there is nothing in either of these verses that does not hold also for pagan and Jewish marriages, true also that Christ in Matt. xix. 3 ff. was not interrogated about Christian marriages nor did His answer apply to these alone, but, as is evident from the context, to marriage generally, for He bases the indissolubility of marriage on its primitive institution by Him "who made man from the beginning." All this is true, but it does not prove that St. Paul, writing to Christians and explaining their difficulties, is not here treating of Christian marriages.

He speaks of *matrimonium ratum et consummatum*, it being the ordinary case (on the special case of *matrim. ratum* he says nothing,) and he commands, rather not he but the Lord, (a) that the wife depart not (Gr. : "be not separated"—either by departing or by giving occasion to her husband to send her away) from her husband, and (b) that the husband put not away his wife. But into this twofold precept of Christ there is inserted, and by St. Paul himself, as the change of construction in the original shows, a precept to the effect that even if the wife depart from her husband she remain unmarried (i.e., without a new marriage, for since she cannot marry again, and since the Apostle supposes her still to have a husband, to whom she can be reconciled, the former marriage is still valid and the bond unbroken) or be reconciled to her husband. We may render, therefore : "But to those who are married, I command, not I but the Lord, that the wife depart not from her husband (but even if she be separated, let her remain [μὴ ἔτω] unmarried or be reconciled to her husband), and that the husband put not away his wife."

It is to be noted (a) that though the Apostle does not mention any cause that would justify *divortium a toro*, he yet supposes such a cause when he says : "But even if she be separated."

uxorem non dimittat. ¹² Nam
ceteris ego dico, non Dominus.
Si quis frater uxorem habet
infidelem, et hæc consentit
habitare cum illo, non dimittat

remain unmarried, or be re-
conciled to her husband.
And let not the husband put
away his wife. ¹² For to the
rest I speak, not the Lord. If
any brother have a wife that
believeth not, and she consent
to dwell with him ; let him not

(b) That he does not mean to leave it to the option of the wife whether she will live apart or be reconciled, but the disjunctive implies that in some cases she may be bound (or be free) to live apart, in some to be reconciled. (c) That though the Apostle does not add in case of the husband that he must remain unmarried or be reconciled, yet this is implied as understood from what precedes, as all the Fathers held, and as must be held in view of Christ's declaration to His disciples : " Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another, committeth adultery against her " (Mark x. 11. Cf. Luke xvi. 18).

12. " For to the rest I speak, not the Lord." Rather, " But to the rest I say not the Lord, if any brother," etc., so that what follows is dependent on the verb " say," in accordance with the ordinary usage in which the object of λέγω is always expressed. " The rest " are those who are neither unmarried, like those in verse 8, nor yet both married Christians like those in verse 10, but the Christian parties in mixed marriages, that is, the husbands or wives who had become Christians after their marriage, their partners still remaining in unbelief (whether paganism or Judaism). Estius and à Lapide indeed hold that " the rest " are the unmarried and widows of verse 8, as if the Apostle said : to the married not I but the Lord commandeth, etc., but to those unmarried I spoke, not the Lord. But in that view the Apostle ought to have used the past tense here and not the present. Moreover, unless we are mistaken, this view is untenable for the reason that Christ while He was on earth did actually speak of the case of the unmarried. For when the disciples had heard Him preach the indissolubility of marriage, they said to Him : " If the case of a man with his wife be so, it is not expedient to marry," and His reply was : " All men take not this word (*i.e.*, about not marrying) but they to whom it is given. . . . He that can take let him take it " (Matt. xix. 10-12), where He clearly recommended celibacy to those who had the gift.

illam. ¹³ Et si qua mulier fidelis put her away. = And if any habet virum infidelem, et hic woman have a husband that consentit habitare cum illa, believeth not, and he consent to dwell with her; let her not

"The rest" then in our text are the Christian parties in mixed marriages. If we suppose the Corinthians in their letter to have put questions regarding the married, the unmarried, and the Christian parties in mixed marriages, the Apostle, having referred to the first two classes in the preceding, would now say quite naturally in reference to the third class: But to the rest I say, not the Lord: if any brother, etc. About these mixed marriages Christ when on earth had said nothing special. He had laid down the general law of matrimony, without indicating the exception to which the Apostle is about to refer, and which has come to be known as *the Casus Apostoli*. Yet we are not to conclude because the Apostle writes: "I say, not the Lord," that what is said is not a divine precept or counsel. St. Paul is not distinguishing divine from human counsels or precepts, but divine precepts promulgated by Christ from divine precepts or counsels promulgated by himself.

In both cases, indeed the teaching has divine authority, for St. Paul writes this letter in the exercise of the plenitude of that Apostolic authority which he had received from the Lord, and under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost (see *vv.* 25, 40; *xiv.* 37).

As Christ's Apostle, then, he tells the Christian party, whether husband or wife, not to put away the unbelieving party, provided the latter consent to live with him (or her). The putting away of which there is question in *vv.* 12, 13 has reference to divorce "*a toro et cohabitatione*," for as the infidel party is supposed to consent to peaceful cohabitation there could be no question in such a case of breaking the *bond* of matrimony.

13. It is a much disputed question whether this direction of the Apostle not to live apart from the unbelieving party who consents to live peaceably is to be regarded as a precept or only as a counsel. It is regarded as a precept by Theod., Oecum., Tert., Jer., Caj., Est., Calm., Mai., Bisp., Drach., and many others. On the other hand, it is regarded as only a counsel by Cyr. of Alex., Damasc., Aug., Pet. Lomb., Thomas, Cornely, and many others. We incline to the latter view, not only on account of the form in which the Apostle gives the direction, but also on account of the practice of the Church. As to the form, the Apostle

non dimittat virum : ¹⁴ Sanctificatus est enim vir infidelis per mulierem fidelem, et sancti- put away her husband. ¹⁴ For the unbelieving husband is sanctified by the believing

no longer speaks of *commanding* as in verse 10, but merely says (*Ἀγῶ* as in vv. 6, 8 where he is counselling) that the faithful party is not to put away the unbelieving party. Moreover, in verse 14 he goes on to give a reason in support of his direction, a reason not founded upon the authority of God nor upon his own Apostolic authority as we might expect if there were question of a Divine or Apostolic precept (see e.g., xi. 16 ; xiv. 37), but upon the spiritual advantage that would be likely to accrue from the advice he gives.

Then as to the practice of the Church, Sanchez boldly makes the statement : " Nunquam obligatum fuisse conjugem fidelem ad cohabitandum cum infideli, etsi hic vellet cohabitare sine injuria creatoris et sine periculo fidelis." (Sanch., *De Matrim.* vii, Disp. 73.) And Feije says : " Si vero respondeat (pars infidelis) se non quidem velle converti, sed velle pacifice et sine contumelia Creatoris cohabitare, pars conversa non tenetur nisi ex caritate, quando conversionis spes probabilis affulget, manere cum infideli. Cum pluribus enim gravissimis auctoribus contra alios opinamur S. Paulum in v. 12 sq. dare consilium, non praeceptum, non dimittendi, quam opinionem existimamus esse praxi Ecclesiae conformem." (De Imped. et Disp. Matr., n. 490.) We take it then that the Apostle counsels the Christian party not to live apart from the unbelieving wife or husband, provided the latter consent to live peaceably, and of course " sine contumelia creatoris." *

But even in this case the Christian party is *not bound* to live with the unbeliever, as the Apostle implies by speaking of the latter's " complacet " (*συμφωνεῖ*), for this " complacet " supposes the " placet " of the believer. Thus even in regard to cohabitation these marriages are an exception to the general rule.

14. The Apostle proceeds to give a reason for the counsel just given, a reason about which there has been much diversity of opinion. For the unbelieving party, he says, is sanctified by the union with the believer. But the difficulty is to see in what sense the unbeliever can be said to be sanctified. All are agreed that it is not meant that true internal sanctity at once accrues

* " Ita nampe ut neque molestias inferat religioni partis fidelis neque eam pertrahat ad peccatum mortale, neque catholicam proles educationem impediat " (Feije, n. 487).

ficata est mulier infidelis per virum fidelem : alioquin filii vestri immundi essent, nunc wife ; and the unbelieving wife is sanctified by the believing husband ; otherwise your children should be unclean ;

to the unbeliever by his union with the Christian.* Nor can there be question of the hope of his *future* conversion, for the Apostle speaks of sanctity already acquired (ἁγιασται). The true view is that there is question of some external sanctity arising from so close a union with the Christian, whereby the unbeliever begins, in an imperfect way, no doubt, to be withdrawn from the dominion of " the prince of this world." As united in marriage with a Christian, whose body is a member of Christ (vi. 15), the unbeliever is to some extent already withdrawn from the world and drawn towards Christ, and his (or her) conversion is made easier (see 1 Pet. iii. 1-2). So substantially St. Chrys., Theod., Jer., Aug.

" Otherwise your children should be unclean, but now they are holy." Some regard this as a second reason why the believing party should not separate from the unbeliever, because in case of separation the children of the marriage would probably be claimed and brought up by the unbelieving party and thus be unclean, whereas if the parents continue to live together the children are likely to be better brought up and thus and by contact with the believing parent will, like their unbelieving parent, be sanctified in the sense already indicated above. But (1) this view would require the conjunction " and " in the text to add this reason to the preceding, and (2) in the rest of this passage the Apostle either speaks of the parties to the mixed marriage in the third person (12-15), or addresses only the Christian party (16), using the singular number. Hence it seems much more probable (a) that this clause gives, not a second reason for not separating, but, a reason for the statement just made that the unbelieving party is sanctified by the believer, and (b) that the children are not the children of mixed marriages but those of Christian marriages. In this view the Apostle argues from the fact that as the unbaptized children of two Christian parents were admittedly in some sense holy or sanctified through

* " Non, opinor, quisquam tam infideliter intelligit, quodlibet in his verbis intelligat, ut ob hoc existimet etiam maritum non christianum, quia christiana fuerit uxor ejus, neque jam baptizari oportere et ad peccatorum remissionem jam pervenisse et in regnum coelorum esse intraturum, quia sanctificatus dictus est in uxore " (S. Aug., *De pecc. merit. = rem.*, II. 26).

autem sancti sunt. ¹⁵ Quod si infidelis discedit, discedat : non enim servituti subiectus est frater aut soror in huiusmodi : in pace autem vocavit nos but now they are holy. ¹⁵ But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. For a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases. But God hath

their relation to their parents, so similarly in regard to the unbelieving wife or husband. They are sanctified in some sense, "otherwise your unbaptized children should be unclean," but, as it is, they are admitted to be holy, i.e., clean, in some sense sanctified, so that you freely associate with them. It is not meant of course that unbaptized children were really and internally sanctified, any more than it is that the unbeliever is internally sanctified by union with the believer. In both cases there is question of the same kind of sanctity (ἁγίασται—ἁγία), and that this is external is indicated by the Apostle when he contrasts with it what is unclean (ἀκάθαρα), for this word is commonly used both in the LXX and the New Testament to designate legal or external uncleanness (See Levit. xi. 25 ; xiii. 45, 46 ; Acts x. 14, 28 ; xi. 8 ; Apoc. xviii. 2.)

If this is the correct view of the clause, it seems to imply that the practice of infant baptism had not yet been introduced in the Church of Corinth.

15. "But if the unbeliever depart, let him depart (for) a brother or sister is not under servitude in such cases." Again the Apostle gives a counsel, for he is not to be understood to bind the faithful party, to make no effort to retain or recall the unbeliever. The whole context shows that the Apostle is dispensing in favour of the Christian party, and not, therefore, intending to restrain his liberty, but anxious to relieve him from the yoke to which either of two separated Christian parties would be subject (v. 11). This yoke in the case made, where the unbelieving party departs, can be nothing else than the yoke arising from the bond of matrimony, which is really a yoke in the case of those who are separated. Hence the Apostle speaks of the widow as "free" (v. 39), and of the married woman as "bound" (Rom. vii. 2), and this bond in the case of those separated becomes a yoke; a yoke, however, which must be borne by two Christian parties who are separated (11), but from which the Apostle here declares the Christian party in a mixed marriage to be in certain cases free. That this is the meaning appears (1) from the antithesis between the case in vv. 10-11 and this. There the Apostle

Deus. ¹⁵ Unde enim scis mulier,
si virum salvum facies? aut
unde scis vir, si mulierem
salvam facies?

called us in peace. ¹⁶ For how
knowest thou, O wife, whether
thou shalt save thy husband?
Or how knowest thou, O man,
whether thou shalt save thy
wife?

¹⁷ Nisi unicuique sicut divisit

¹⁷ But as the Lord hath dis-
tributed to everyone, as God

says that if the parties become separated they must remain unmarried or become reconciled; here he simply says: let him depart, without adding any condition. (2) If the Apostle in the words, "Let him depart," were merely authorising separation and not remarriage, he would grant little or nothing, for separation has already become necessary for the faithful party by the departure of the unbeliever. (3) In declaring the faithful party not to be subject to servitude in the case, the only servitude that the Apostle can be reasonably understood to refer to, whether we regard the context here or his language in other passages regarding the bond of matrimony (v. 39, Rom. vii. 2), is the servitude arising from having to remain unmarried while forced to live apart from the former partner. Hence the unanimous opinion of the Fathers, the teaching of the Popes, the practice of the Church and the common view of Theologians and Canonists, has always been that St. Paul here authorises the right of remarriage in the case made. And this doctrine, though not *de fide*, is certain.

If the faithful party choose to exercise this right, the former marriage is dissolved as soon as the second marriage is contracted, not before.*

"But God hath called us in peace"; i.e., that we may live in holy peace. This and the following verse seem to refer specially to the case of the unbeliever who, while willing to remain physically, yet departs morally by opposing the Christian faith. To continue to live with such a husband or wife is opposed to Christian peace.

16. Lest anyone should say that the faithful party should be bound to endeavour to live on with such a person in the hope of converting him, the Apostle here implies that the hope is too uncertain to justify any such obligation.

17. The meaning of $\epsilon\lambda\ \mu\eta$ (nisi) and the connection are obscure. Estius gives the particles their ordinary exceptive force and con-

* See Feije, *ibid.*, n. 498.

Dominus, unumquemque sicut vocavit Deus, ita ambulet, et sicut in omnibus ecclesiis doceo. = Circumcisis aliquis vocatus est? non adducat praeputium. In praeputio aliquis vocatus est? non circumcidatur. ¹⁸ Circumcisio nihil est, et prae-

hath called every one, so let him walk: and so in all churches I teach. ¹⁸ Is any man called being circumcised? let him not procure uncircumcision. Is any man called in uncircumcision? let him not be circumcised. ¹⁹ Circumcision is nothing, and

nects with the preceding verse: How knowest thou whether thou shalt save thy wife *unless* indeed, as the Lord distributes His gifts variously, He gives thee the gift of bearing with such a partner and at length converting him (or her)? But this seems forced and improbable. Erasmus explains: *However this may be* (referring to the doubtful question in v. 16) I pass on to what is certain, and lay down the general rule that conversion to Christianity is not to be regarded as breaking up previous relations. We think the particles are not exceptive here but adversative (see Matt. xii. 4; Rom. xiv. 14; Gal. i. 7; Apoc. ix. 4), and that the sense is given by our own version: "*But* as the Lord," * etc. The Apostle is passing on to teach that, in general, conversion to Christianity does not free a man from his obligations nor alter his relations to society. He has just spoken of one serious exception to this rule, and now he adds: "But (outside that case) as the Lord hath distributed to everyone, . . . so let him walk." Let each one live in correspondence with the graces which Christ has bestowed upon him, and, if it be possible while corresponding with these graces, in the state of life in which he was when God called him to the faith, and so (for "sicut" of Vulgate read "sic") ordain I in all the churches.

18. The Apostle illustrates what he means. Was anyone called to the faith after he had been circumcised? "Non adducat praeputium," i.e., let him not seek to remove the marks of circumcision,† as though it were wrong for a Christian to bear in his body the mark of Judaism. Was anyone called not having been circumcised? Let him not seek to be circumcised, as if the mark of Judaism were necessary for a Christian.

19. For circumcision or uncircumcision is of no account unto salvation for a Christian, but the keeping of the Commandments of God (Cf. Gal. v. 6; vi. 15).

* The A.V. has "but," and the R.V. "only."

† "Nimirum arte medica et quibusdam instrumentis residuam praeputii pelliculam attrahentes" (Est.)

putium nihil est : sed observatio mandatorum Dei. ²⁰ Unusquisque in qua vocatione vocatus est, in ea permaneat. ²¹ Servus vocatus es ? non sit tibi curae : sed et si potes fieri liber, magis utere. ²² Qui enim in Domino vocatus est servus, libertus est Domini : similiter qui liber vocatus est, servus est Christi. ²³ Pretio empti estis, nolite fieri

uncircumcision is nothing : but the observation of the commandments of God. ²⁰ Let every man abide in the same calling in which he was called. ²¹ Wast thou called, being a bond-man ? care not for it : but if thou mayest be made free, use it rather. ²² For he that is called in the Lord, being a bond-man, is the freeman of the Lord. Likewise he that is called, being free, is the bond-man of Christ. ²³ You are

20. The Apostle repeats the general exhortation of v. 17 in order to subjoin another example. "The same calling" is, as the following shows, the same state of life ; a state of life, if it be good, as is here supposed, is itself appointed by God and something to which God called.

21. "But if thou mayest be made free, use it rather." It is disputed whether "it" refers to freedom or to slavery. But (a) the scope of the Apostle, which is to dissuade converts from a change in their state of life (for such changes would be likely to bring odium on the Christian religion), (b) the next verse, which declares that even a slave is free, for he is "the freedman of the Lord," (c) the Greek text, which means "But if you *even are able* to become free," seem to make it more probable that the Apostle *counsels* the slave to remain a slave. He might judge it prudent to give such counsel, in order that the Christian religion should not be accused of tending in any way to interfere with the existing relations between slaves and their masters.

23. Some think that only the free are here addressed, as in v. 21 the slaves. But we may well doubt whether the Apostle thought it necessary to counsel those who were free not to become the slaves of men, since few ever became slaves willingly. Rather since all, both slaves and free, were bought with a price, we may take it that all are addressed and warned against so making themselves the servants of men as to forget, or be less zealous in, the service of God. In warning those who were the servants of Christ not to become servants of men, the Apostle clearly implies Christ's Divinity. In saying they were bought with a price he means a great price, otherwise there was no need to

servi hominum. ²⁴ Unusquisque in quo vocatus est, fratres, in hoc permaneat apud Deum.

²⁵ De virginibus autem preceptum Domini non habeo:

bought with a price, be not made the bond-slaves of men. ²⁴ Brethren, let every man wherein he was called, therein abide with God.

²⁵ Now concerning virgins, I have no commandment of the

mention price at all, for everything that is bought, is bought at some price. The price was the blood of Christ (1 Peter i. 18, 19).

24. For the third time he repeats his exhortation that they should remain in the state and condition in which they were when called to the faith. Of course a sinful state is not meant, for in such it would not be possible to "abide with God," i.e., serving God and not withdrawing from Him.

25. The remainder of the chapter is taken up with the Apostle's counsels in reference to virgins and widows. First he counsels virginity (25-28), then gives reason why he counsels it (29-35), next counsels parents in reference to their daughters (36-38), and finally declares second marriage to be lawful, but counsels widowhood (39-40).

The Apostle now takes up formally the question which he had already touched upon in *vv.* 8, 9. There was a special reason why he should do so here. For besides the fact that it is probable he was asked by the Corinthians whether those who had been called to the faith as virgins might afterwards marry, the preceding teaching of the Apostle in this chapter (17-24) in which he counsels continuance in the state in which each one was called to the faith, might be taken to forbid marriage to those who were called as virgins.

He begins by saying that he has no *precept* of the Lord in reference to virgins, as he had in reference to the married (*v.* 10). He does not say that he has no counsel of the Lord on the subject, nay he avoids the formula "I say, not the Lord" (*v.* 12), which would exclude even a counsel of Christ, as if to exclude only the Lord's precept. And as we said above on verse 12, we believe the Lord had given a counsel in reference to virginity, whatever may have been St. Paul's reason for not mentioning it here.

Παρθένος, like the Latin *virgo*, is applied in profane writers only to the female sex, but in ecclesiastical use the word is applied to both sexes, and the plural is so used by St. John (Apoc. xiv. 4). Whether St. Paul here uses it in its narrower sense, but intending

consilium autem do, tanquam misericordiam consecutus a Domino, ut sim fidelis. ²⁸ Existimo ergo hoc bonum esse propter instantem necessitatem

Lord: but I give counsel, as having obtained mercy of the Lord, to be faithful. ²⁸ I think therefore that this is good for the present necessity, that it

what he has to say, to extend to men also, as it certainly does extend (28, 32, 33), or, as seems more probable, in the wider sense, matters nothing.

Modestly but confidently the Apostle commends his own counsel as that of one who had obtained from God the mercy or grace to be trustworthy.* See also v. 40. Note that the Apostle clearly recognises the difference between a precept and a counsel. "Præceptum est," says St. Augustine, "cui non obedire peccatum est; consilium vero, quo si uti nolueris, minus boni adipisceris, non mali aliquid perpetrabis." *De Virginitate*, cap. 15.

26. The Apostle now states what his counsel is: "I think therefore that this is good ('fine,' 'excellent,' see on v. 1) for the present necessity, namely, that it is good for a man (or woman) so to be." "For the present necessity," i.e., on account of (ὥς with accus.) the anxieties and troubles of this life which are always with us,† and which are less in the single than in the married state.

Most recent Protestant commentators and some Catholics (Bisping, Mai) hold that the Apostle refers not to the anxieties of life, but to what he considered the near approach of the second coming of Christ and of the tribulations accompanying it, which our Lord had referred to as "great distress" (ἀνάγκη μεγάλη). Luke xxi. 23.

But, whatever may be said of St. Paul's private view regarding the nearness or remoteness of the day of judgment, it certainly seems to us that it cannot be held, consistently with the Catholic notion of inspiration, that the Apostle in an inspired Epistle could intend to teach that the day of judgment was at hand. See above on iii. 15.

Christ had indeed left uncertain the time of that day in order that all might always watch (Matt. xxiv. 36, 42), and uncertain

* Perrone mistakes the sense, when he cites this text to prove that grace (mercy) is necessary for faith (Perr., *De Gratia*, § 71).

† Ἐνεσθῶν ("præsentem," rather than "instantem" here) is sometimes used of what is future, but often also of what is actually present, e.g., iii. 22; Rom. viii. 38; Gal. i. 4; Heb. ix. 9.

quoniam bonum est homini sic esse. ²⁷ Alligatus es uxori? noli quaerere solutionem. Solutus es ab uxore? noli quaerere uxorem. ²⁸ Si autem acceperis uxorem, non peccasti. Et si nupserit virgo, non peccavit; tribulationem tamen carnis habebunt huiusmodi. Ego autem vobis parco.

²⁹ Hoc itaque dico, fratres:

is good for a man so to be. ²⁷ Art thou bound to a wife? seek not to be loosed. Art thou loosed from a wife? seek not a wife. ²⁸ But if thou take a wife, thou hast not sinned. And if a virgin marry, she hath not sinned: nevertheless, such shall have tribulation of the flesh. But I spare you.

²⁹ This therefore I say,

it no doubt was to the Apostles, but that is a very different thing from saying that the Holy Ghost allowed the Apostle to use language which definitely implied its near approach. In reality St. Paul nowhere uses such language (though it would seem that the Holy Ghost permitted him to use *ambiguous* language), and a few years before the present Epistle was written to the Corinthians, he had actually warned the Thessalonians against the belief that the day of judgment was at hand (2 Thess. ii. 2 f.; iii. 6 f.).

27. Yet though virginity is excellent, those who are married are not to seek for a dissolution of their marriage. On the other hand, those who are not married ought not to seek to be married. "Loosed from a wife," if taken strictly, would refer to a widower, but as opposed here to "bound to a wife," it probably means all unmarried, whether never married or widowers.

28. He explains that the words "seek not a wife" contain only a counsel. "Such" are not merely the *women* who marry, but all who marry (οἱ τοιοῦτοι). Hence the "tribulation of (or 'in') the flesh" does not refer to the pains of childbirth, but to the anxieties and troubles of life, which are greater in the married state, inasmuch as the married person has to think not only of self but of the partner and children.

The words "But I spare you" are taken by some to mean: but I wish to spare you these anxieties, and hence I counsel you to remain unmarried. Others understand: But I spare you by not enumerating these tribulations. Others again: But I indulge your weakness by permitting matrimony. The first view seems the most natural (cf. v. 32), but the second is not improbable in view of 2 Cor. xii. 6.

29. "This therefore I say." Gr.: "*But* this I say." He proceeds to explain (Comp. xv. 50) why the unmarried state is

Tempus breve est : reliquum brethren : the time is short : it est, ut et qui habent uxores, remaineth, that they also who tanquam non habentes sint : have wives, be as if they had
 29 Et qui flent, tanquam non none : 30 And they that weep,

to be preferred in view of the anxieties and troubles of life. The argument is that since the time is short and all worldly things are fleeting, we ought to make the most of the time, to serve and please God (29-31) ; but the unmarried state best enables us to do this (32-34). Therefore though not of precept it is preferable, because leaving us more free to serve God assiduously without distraction (35).

" The time is short* (or shortened, i.e., by God's arrangement) ; it remaineth (as a conclusion to be acted upon) that both they who have wives be as if they had none," etc. Or taking τὸ λοιπὸν as equal " henceforth," and ἵνα with the subj. as having the force of an imper. (cf. J. H. Moulton, *Gr.*, p. 178), we get what is probably the true sense : " Henceforth let those who have wives," etc. " The time " is understood by many of the Greek commentators to be the time till the day of judgment, but with most of the Latins we prefer to take it of the span of human life. But if the former view be preferred, it must not be concluded that the day of judgment is represented as at hand, for " with the Lord a thousand years are as one day " (2 Pet. iii. 8).

We have followed the punctuation of the Vulgate which connects τὸ λοιπὸν (" reliquum est ") not with what precedes, but with what follows.† If it were connected with what precedes the sense would be : The time is shortened *henceforth* or : The time *that remains* is shortened, etc., etc.

From the shortness of life then the Apostle concludes that we ought to use it diligently in the service of God, and those who are married (while fulfilling their duties to each other, vv. 3, 5) ought not to allow themselves to be drawn away from God by the pleasures or the cares of their state.

30. Similarly sorrows and joys and earthly possessions must be viewed in the light of the one thing necessary (" the things of the Lord, how to please God," v. 32).

* On in the common Greek text is spurious.

† " Quodsi objicitur, particulam ἵνα, utpote finalem, cum τὸ λοιπὸν (reliquum est) conjungi non posse, quia vi sua finali privaretur, respondemus, eam in Novo Test. frequenter ejusmodi formulis adjungi, ut vis finalis non nisi contortis explanationibus extundatur ; confer Matt. viii. 8 ; i. 27 ; Matt. x. 25 ; Matt. xviii. 6 " (Corn., defending the sense of the Vulgate).

flentes : et qui gaudent, tanquam non gaudentes : et qui emunt, tanquam non possidentes : ³¹ Et qui utuntur hoc mundo, tanquam non utantur : praeterit enim figura huius mundi. ³² Volo autem vos sine sollicitudine esse. Qui sine uxore est, sollicitus est quae Domini sunt, quomodo placeat Deo. ³³ Qui autem cum uxore est, sollicitus est quae sunt mundi, quomodo placeat uxori, et divisus est. ³⁴ Et mulier

as though they wept not ; and they that rejoice, as if they rejoiced not ; and they that buy, as though they possessed not ; ³¹ And they that use this world, as if they used it not ; for the fashion of this world passeth away. ³² But I would have you to be without solicitude. He that is without a wife, is solicitous for the things that belong to the Lord, how he may please God. ³³ But he that is with a wife, is solicitous for the things of the world, how he may please his wife : and he is divided. ³⁴ And the un-

31. And in general the things of the world are to be used so as not to be abused nor even used to their full extent (*χρῶμενοι—καταχρῶμενοι*). The compound *καταχρῶμενοι* may be understood either of abusing the world's goods, or in the sense of using to the full, taking all the pleasure we can out of them. If the latter be the sense here, as seems probable from the whole context, then the Corinthians are warned not merely against abusing the world's goods, but even against using them to the full. "Utantur iis obiter et velut in transcurso" (Est.).

"For the fashion of this world passeth away." *Τὸ σῆμα* ("the fashion"), is the outward appearance of a thing (see Phil. ii. 7). The substance of the world shall not be destroyed at the day of judgment (Rom. viii. 21 ; 2 Pet. iii. 13), but it shall be changed and purified. Hence St. Jerome : "Figura praeterit, non substantia." Not only then is life short, but the world is fleeting ; hence we ought not to allow it to draw us away from God.

32. Having shown that we ought not to allow ourselves to be drawn away from God by the world's cares, the Apostle proceeds to show that this detachment is easier for the unmarried. For "Deo" at the end of the verse in Vulgate read "Domino."

33. "And he is divided," i.e., between his duties to God and to his wife. Family cares necessarily distract him.

34. And what is true of the unmarried and the married man, is true likewise of the unmarried and the married woman ; the

innupta, et virgo, cogitat quae Domini sunt, ut sit sancta corpore et spiritu. Quae autem nupta est, cogitat quae sunt mundi, quomodo placeat viro.
 35 Porro hoc ad utilitatem vestram dico : non ut laqueum

married woman and the virgin thinketh on the things of the Lord : that she may be holy both in body and in spirit. But she that is married thinketh on the things of the world, how she may please her husband.
 35 And this I speak for your

married cannot attend so perfectly to the things of the Lord. It is clear then that in recommending virginity on account of " the present necessity " (v. 26) and to avoid " tribulation of the flesh " (v. 28), the Apostle had in view eternal interests, and not alone temporal happiness or convenience. And vv. 32-34 show clearly that in the view of the Apostle the unmarried state is *more perfect* than the married.

It matters little whether we take " the unmarried woman and the virgin " to mean the widow and the woman never married, or regard the second term as explaining the first : the unmarried woman, namely, the virgin. That the Apostle mentions formally the case of the widow later on (39-40) does not forbid us to hold that he includes reference to widows here.

We have followed the punctuation and connection of the Vulgate in the end of 33 and the beginning of 34. This represents a Greek reading adopted by Corn., Lach., Tr., W.H. : πὼς ἀπέσῃ τῇ γυναίκί καὶ μεμέρισται. Καὶ ἡ γυνὴ ἡ ἀγαπῶσα καὶ ἡ παρθένος μεριμνᾷ, κ.τ.λ.

There is, however, another reading which is also strongly supported and which is followed in its text (though not in the margin) by the Revised Version, connecting καὶ μεμέρισται with what follows, and understanding it to mean : " and there is a difference," and reading ἡ ἀγαπῶσα immediately before μεριμνᾷ. Thus the Revised Version (text) reads : 33, " But he that is married is careful for the things of the world ; how he may please his wife. 34, And there is a difference also between the wife and the virgin. She that is unmarried is careful," etc. The Vulgate reading seems preferable,* but in either the superior perfection of the unmarried to the married state is equally clear.

35. The Apostle now signifies that he does not want to bind them to the more perfect state, but merely wishes to let them

* In the second reading the sing. μεμέρισται cannot well be explained. The sense would require a plural verb.

vobis iniiciam, sed ad id quod honestum est, et quod facultatem praebeat sine impedimento Dominum obsecrandi.

³⁶ Si quis autem turpem se videri existimat super virgine sua, quod sit superadulta, et ita oportet fieri : quod vult faciat :

profit : not to cast a snare upon you, but for that which is decent, and which may give you power, to attend upon the Lord, without impediment.

³⁶ But if any man think that he seemeth dishonoured with regard to his virgin, for that

know that it is the more perfect and contributes better to the assiduous and undistracted service of God.

"Not to cast a snare upon you." Animals ensnared are deprived of their liberty, but in the present matter the Apostle does not intend to deprive his readers of the liberty to marry, which Christ had granted, by imposing upon them a precept of virginity.—"But for that which is decent." The Revised Version renders: "But for that which is seemly, and that you may attend upon the Lord without distraction." Since marriage also is both decent and seemly, the meaning here must be: "for that which is *more perfect*."

"Two things," says Calvin, "are here to be noted—(1) the end for which celibacy is to be desired, viz., not for itself as being a more perfect state but to enable one to serve God without distraction. (2) That no constraint is to be put upon the conscience, but everyone be free to judge for himself." On which it need only be remarked (1) that the state in which we can serve God better is the more perfect state; and (2) that no restraint is to be put upon the conscience of those who have not yet deprived themselves by their own choice of their liberty; but if they have so deprived themselves, then we know from St. Paul himself that they are no longer free (1 Tim. v. 12).

36. The Apostle in this and the two following verses lays down practical rules for the guidance of parents in regard to their unmarried daughters. But it is to be noted that he does not authorise parents to decide, regardless of their daughter's own wish, whether she shall marry or not, for though ordinarily it may be right for a daughter to allow her parents to decide as between suitor and suitor, it is not right that she should allow them to decide whether she shall marry at all or not. "But if any man think that he seemeth dishonoured," etc. According to this rendering, δοxxηνομεν is taken passively. Others take it actively in the sense: if any man think that he behaveth in an

non peccat, si nubat. ³⁷ Nam qui statuit in corde suo firmus, non habens necessitatem, potestatem autem habens suae voluntatis, et hoc iudicavit in corde suo, servare virginem she is above the age, and it must so be : let him do what he will : he sinneth not, if she marry. ³⁷ For he that hath determined being steadfast in his heart, having no necessity, but having power of his own will ; and hath judged this in

unbecoming manner in regard to his daughter (in not furthering her marriage). In the first view, the dishonour thought to come to the father is supposed to arise from the fact that his daughter's failure to marry might be set down to his niggardliness in not supplying her with a dowry, or, according to others, from the danger of the girl's corruption, which was particularly great in Corinth.

"For that (Gr. : 'if') she is above the age."—Vulg. : "super-adulta." The word *ὑπερᾶν* which occurs nowhere else in the Bible, is commonly understood to mean that the girl is considerably past her prime, but we believe that Grimm gives the true sense : "maturitate turgescens, ideoque stupri periculo facilius obnoxia."

"And it must be so," i.e., if the daughter is bent upon not leading a life of virginity, or if other reasons, such as special danger of immorality in her case, make such a decision necessary.

"Let him do what he will." St. Thomas understands : let the father do what the daughter wishes, but such a difference of subject for the two verbs of the clause is unlikely, and the meaning must be either : let the daughter do what she desires, or rather : let the father do what he desires. Naturally the father's desire in such a case would be that the girl should marry, and the Apostle tells him to act accordingly.

"He sinneth not, if she marry." Read : "he sinneth not, let them marry," for which the evidence is decisive. Some take "let them marry" to refer to the girl and her suitor ; others understand : let the parents give them in marriage ; but most probably the sense is : let the daughters marry, for though *γαμίζω* is used ordinarily only of men, it is used elsewhere in this chapter (v. 9, 34) of women. The sense of the verse then is, that if a parent feel or fear dishonour in the case of a daughter, who is of full age and wants to marry, he may do what he can to further her wishes and allow her to marry.

37-8. "For he that hath determined," etc. Read : "but he that

suam, bene facit. ³⁸ Igitur et qui matrimonio iungit virginem suam, bene facit : et qui non iungit, melius facit.

³⁹ Mulier alligata est legi quanto tempore vir eius vivit ; quod si dormierit vir eius, liberata est : cui vult nubat, tantum in Domino. ⁴⁰ Beatior autem erit si sic permanserit, secundum meum consilium : puto autem quod et ego Spiritum Dei habeam.

his heart to keep his virgin, doth well. ³⁸ Therefore both he that giveth his virgin in marriage doth well : and he that giveth her not, doth better.

³⁹ A woman is bound by the law as long as her husband liveth : but if her husband die, she is at liberty : let her marry to whom she will : only in the Lord. ⁴⁰ But more blessed shall she be, if she so remain, according to my counsel : and I think that I also have the Spirit of God.

standeth," etc. "The father who *standeth steadfast* is the antithesis of him who fancies himself *dishonoured*, v. 36 and is moved at the thought of the bad figure that he makes in the eyes of his neighbours, not seeming able to dispose of his daughter. The *steadfast* parent does not mind that reproach. Moreover, he is supposed to be *having* no necessity, that is, there is no reason, whether strong inclination in the girl or danger to her virtue, why it *must be so*, v. 36, that he give her in marriage ; but he *having power of his own will*, and she of her's, he *hath judged to keep his virgin*, and she to remain a virgin. Such a father *doth well*, and such a daughter. Nay even, he *doth better*, v. 38 ; and she doth better also, God calling her to a state which is a better good than marriage. Such is the Apostle's plain teaching" (Rick.).

39. The Apostle now states, first, that marriage is indissoluble ; secondly, that a widow can remarry ; thirdly, that she ought to marry a Christian. The words, "by the law" and the Vulgate "legi" are probably spurious here, and due to Rom. vii. 2.

40. "More blessed," i.e., on account of the greater perfection of the unmarried state (33-34), and by reason of her greater freedom from the cares of the world.

"And I think that I also." The Apostle had no doubt about the matter, but as Estius says : "minus dicit, plus volens intelligi." His counsels, he says, were directed by the Spirit of God, as much as were those of the other Apostles. There may be special allusion to the other teachers whom some of the Corinthians so much admired.

CHAPTER VIII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

Those who have true knowledge know that an idol cannot defile things that have been sacrificed to it, but some have not this knowledge, and for these the eating of things sacrificed to idols is clearly unlawful (vv. 1-7). Food is "per se" indifferent in its bearing on our salvation, yet he who has full knowledge of this must take care that by eating he do not scandalise a weaker brother (8-13).

¹ DE iis autem quae idolis sacrificantur, scimus quia omnes scientiam habemus. Scientia inflat, charitas vero aedificat.

¹ Now concerning those things that are sacrificed to idols, we know that we all have knowledge. Knowledge puffeth

Another question on which the Corinthians had consulted the Apostle (περί δὲ τῶν κ.τ.λ.) regarded the liceity of eating meats that had been sacrificed to idols, and this he now discusses up to the end of Chapter x. The question was extremely practical, for in a place like Corinth, where the Christians were drawn largely from the Gentiles (Acts xviii. 6), they must have been often invited by their pagan friends to sacrificial banquets or to private entertainments where meats that had been offered to an idol were served at table. Nay, they must have often come across such meats on the butchers' stalls. For when an animal was offered in sacrifice, little more than its entrails was usually destroyed in honour of the idol: the remainder, with the exception of a portion allotted to the priests and a portion partaken of by the offerers in a sacrificial banquet, was brought home for future consumption or sold to a butcher. Hence, as we have said, the question which the Apostle now proceeds to discuss was a very practical one.

1. "Now, concerning things sacrificed to idols, we know," etc. If we compare the opening words of this verse with verse 4, it seems probable that the sense is here suspended, and that the object of the verb "know" is expressed only in verse 4. Then the words: "For (ὅτι) we all have knowledge," and all that follows up to the end of verse 3, are thrown in parenthetically.

² Si quis autem se existimat scire aliquid, nondum cognovit quemadmodum oporteat eum up : but charity edifieth. ² And if any man think that he knoweth anything, he hath not yet known, as he ought

It may be that the Corinthians in their letter used the words : " we all have knowledge " ; if so the Apostle takes up the words, and admits their truth in regard to all the better instructed, though not in regard to all absolutely (see v. 7) ; then proceeds to imply that knowledge of itself is not enough for the solution of the question at issue. For " knowledge puffeth up," *i.e.*, makes a man proud and self-sufficient. It is to be noted that the Apostle is speaking not of merely worldly knowledge but of that which he and the better instructed Corinthians possessed, and which enabled them to judge rightly that an idol has no power to defile food. Such knowledge is good in itself, and it is only when it is separated from charity and wrongly used that it puffeth up (2 Cor. xii. 7).—" But charity edifieth," *i.e.*, the love of God (v. 3), which implies also love of the neighbour, buildeth up. Considering the whole Church and each of the faithful as a temple of God (iii. 10 ; vi. 19), he means that charity, which makes us take account of our neighbour's salvation as well as of our own, contributes to the building up and perfection of God's temple. The Apostle does not speak of charity without knowledge as he spoke of knowledge without charity, for charity being the fulfilment of the whole law will bring knowledge with it, as far as this is necessary.

2. *Δι* (autem) is probably to be omitted, as also *οὐδέν*. " If any man thinketh that he knoweth anything, he knoweth* not yet as he ought to know." Here too there is question of the man who, without charity, thinks that he has knowledge whether in regard to meats offered to idols or in regard to any other questions connected with the Christian religion. Such a man does not yet know as he ought to know, *i.e.*, he has not the true knowledge which would take account of his neighbour. Or the meaning may be : he does not yet know *how* he ought to know. For since he fancies that he has knowledge, though he lacks charity, it follows that he doesn't know in what true knowledge consists, *i.e.*, he doesn't know *how* he ought to know. But the natural meaning of *καθώς* is in favour of the former view.

* The Perf. with a Present signification.

scire. ³ Si quis autem diligit Deum, hic cognitus est ab eo. ⁴ De escis autem quæ idolis immolantur, scimus quia nihil est idolum in mundo, et quod nullus est Deus, nisi unus, to know. ³ But if any man love God, the same is known by Him. ⁴ But as for the meats that are sacrificed to idols, we know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no

3. "But if any man love God, the same is known by Him." As verse 2 is connected in thought with the clause "knowledge puffeth up" (v. 1), so is the present verse with the clause "charity buildeth up." The sense is that he who loves God, and therefore his neighbour (1 John iv. 20), is known by God with the knowledge of approval; * such a one will therefore have God's gifts poured out on him, and thus he will obtain true knowledge as far as it is necessary for his own salvation or that of his neighbour. The antithesis between vv. 2 and 3 would lead us to expect in the latter: But if any man love God, he knows as he ought to know. But the Apostle, while implying this, says much more than this in saying that such a one is known by God. We have said that to be "known by God" is to be approved by Him, and God's knowledge of us in the case is not the cause of our love for Him but the effect (cf. John xiv. 23). It is true, indeed, that God loved us before we loved Him (1 John iv. 10), and it is only through His love for us that we are enabled to love Him, but it is also true that it is only after we love Him that He knows us with the knowledge of approval of which there is question here. Hence we do not agree with Estius, MacEvilly and others who hold that the Perf. (ἐγνωστοι) is used to signify that God's love for us preceded ours for Him. But as in the preceding verse, so here, the Perf. has a present signification.†

4. The true reading is: "Concerning therefore (οὖν) the eating of things sacrificed to idols." After the digression in which the Apostle has pointed out the nature of true knowledge, οὖν resumes the subject of verse 1, and the sense there suspended is completed. — "We know that an idol is nothing in the world, and that there is no God but one." The inference of course is, that since an idol is nothing it can effect or affect nothing, and therefore cannot render meats impure. Hence *per se* such meats may be eaten.

The Greek ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον, κ.τ.λ. might be rendered in two

* For γινώσκω in this sense, compare Matt. vii. 23; John x. 14, 27; Gal. iv. 9; Phil. iii. 10; 2 Tim. ii. 10.

† See Beel., *ibid.*, p. 277. The R.V. renders "is known."

*Nam etsi sunt qui dicantur dii, sive in coelo sive in terra (siquidem sunt dii multi, et domini multi) : *Nobis tamen unus est Deus, Pater, ex quo omnia, et nos in illum : et unus Dominus IESUS CHRISTUS, per quem omnia, et nos per ipsum.

God, but one. * For although there be that are called gods either in heaven, or on earth (for there be gods many, and lords many) ; * Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, of whom are all things, and we unto Him : and one Lord JESUS CHRIST, by whom are all things,

other ways than in our English version, either : " We know that nothing is an idol in the world, and that no one is God but one," or " We know that there is no idol in the world, and that there is no God but one." It is in favour of the last rendering, which is adopted by many moderns, that the two clauses seem to be parallel, and that since οὐδείς is taken adjectivally in the second clause, οὐδὲν ought to be taken similarly in the first. Yet, as an idol is properly an image worshipped as God or believed to be God, of which there were really many in the world while this last view makes the Apostle say that there was no idol in the world, it is better to follow our own English translation, and understand the Apostle to say that " an idol is nothing," *formaliter*, i.e., though it had a real existence as wood or stone or metal, it was nothing in its representative character, since the god it professed to represent had no existence. As Cajetan says : " Imago enim, quae nullius est imago, nihil est quatenus imago ; similiter simulacrum, quod nullius est simulacrum, nihil est quatenus simulacrum." Such has always been the more common explanation of the first clause, and the apparent parallelism of the two clauses is hardly a sufficient reason for denying that οὐδὲν is taken substantively here, as it often is in other places.

5-6. The meaning is : for though there be so-called gods, celestial or terrestrial (since indeed there are many gods and many lords according to the beliefs of the various peoples) yet for us Christians there is but one God, one First Cause, and we Christians unto Him as our supernatural end ; and one Lord, namely, Jesus Christ, the Son of God incarnate, through whom as Son all things were made, and through whom as Son incarnate we were redeemed. The Father as the fountain, so to speak, of the Godhead is here called God, while the Son through whom all things were made (" omnia per ipsum facta sunt," John i. 3), and through whom Christians were efficaciously redeemed is

⁊ Sed non in omnibus est scientia. Quidam autem cum conscientia usque nunc idoli, quasi idolothytum manducant: et conscientia ipsorum cum sit infirma, polluitur.

and we by Him. ⁷ But there is not knowledge in every one. For some until this present with conscience of the idol, eat as a thing sacrificed to an idol: and their conscience, being weak, is defiled.

appropriately called Lord; but it must, of course, be borne in mind that the Son is also God, just as the Father is also Lord. If the Arians would conclude from this verse that the Son is not God, then, to be consistent, they ought to conclude that the Father is not Lord—a conclusion which, of course, they could not accept.

The verse declares that there is only one true God in opposition to the false belief in many gods. That there are three Persons in the Godhead the verse does not deny, nay, it may be fairly argued that since the Apostle mentions a Father in the Godhead, he implies a Son of the same nature, and therefore a Divine Son. It is true we might have expected the Apostle to have written: Yet to us there is but one God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and one Lord, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, but possibly he feared that the explicit mention of the three Divine Persons might confuse the less instructed of the Corinthians and drive them back into Polytheism; while the fact that the Father is the fountain of the Godhead, and the Son the Creator and Redeemer, is sufficient reason for appropriating Godhead to the Father and Lordship to the Son.

From vv. 4-6 it follows that an idol, being merely material and having no connection with any existing Divinity, could neither sanctify meats, as the Gentiles believed; nor defile them, as the Jews feared. Hence *per se* meats offered to idols could be eaten.

7. But, he continues, the knowledge necessary to draw this practical conclusion (ἡ γνῶσις) is not in everyone. All the Corinthian Christians believed, of course, that there is but one God and one Lord, but they were not all able to apply this knowledge so as to draw the practical conclusion that no sanctity or defilement could attach to meats offered to idols.

"With conscience of the idol," i.e., with belief that the idol had power to defile, and with the consequent *practical judgment* that they ought not to partake of meats offered to it. Instead of τῇ συνειδήσει τοῦ εἰδώλου, "with conscience of the idol," the

* *Esca autem nos non commendat Deo. Neque enim si manducaverimus, abundabimus: neque si non mandu-*

* But meat doth not commend us to God. For neither, if we eat, shall we have the more: nor, if we eat not, shall

three oldest Greek MSS. B & A and the Coptic and Aeth. VV. read τῇ συνηθείᾳ τοῦ εἰδώλου "through being used to the idol," and this reading is preferred by many modern critics. But the reading followed by the Vulgate is that of D E F G L and most cursive MSS., and of the Vet. It., Syriac and Armenian Versions. Besides, as the more difficult reading owing to the strangeness of the expression "conscience of the idol," it is more likely to be the true one.

"Eat as a thing sacrificed to an idol," i.e., regarding it formally under that aspect and as such forbidden to them, and thus their conscience being badly instructed and weak is defiled. It follows from the verse that through an erroneous conscience a man may sin, while doing a thing that in itself is not forbidden. For whoever acts against the practical judgment of his reason when it declares (even though erroneously) a thing to be wrong, such a one sins. "Omne autem, quod non est ex fide, peccatum est" (Rom. xiv. 23).

8. The Apostle declares that such meats, or indeed any meats, do not make us better in the sight of God. This is added, perhaps, on account of some who might say that they honoured God by partaking indiscriminately of all that He created.

"For neither if we eat shall we have the more (Gr. Pres.: "have we more"), nor if we eat not shall we have the less" (Gr.: "have we less"), i.e., in the sight of God. Some ancient authorities reverse the order of the two clauses.

Some have absurdly attempted to argue from this verse against Catholic teaching and practice in reference to fasting. But the Apostle is speaking of meats considered in themselves and as affected by no law and therefore as things indifferent. No doubt some years before this time the Council of Jerusalem had prohibited to the Gentile Christians of Antioch, Syria, and Cilicia meats offered to idols (Acts xv. 23, 29), but throughout the present section the Apostle makes no reference to that prohibition, but plainly regards those meats in reference to the Corinthians as affected by no law. Hence it is an entirely different case when the Church by her law prohibits certain meats at certain times; and the fact that the Council of Jerusalem prohibited things

caverimus deficiemus. * Videte autem ne forte hæc licentia vestra offendiculum fiat infirmis. ¹⁰ Si enim quis viderit eum qui habet scientiam, in idolo recubentem : nonne conscientia eius, cum sit infirma, aedificabitur ad mandu-

we have the loss. * But take heed lest perhaps this your liberty become a stumbling-block to the weak. ¹⁰ For if a man see him that hath knowledge sit at meat in the idol's temple ; shall not his conscience, being weak, be emboldened to eat those things

indifferent warrants us in saying that the Church at all times can do the same. Whenever she does, abstinence from such meats is an act of obedience as well as of temperance.

9. The Apostle now adds that this liberty (power to eat or not eat such meats) is so to be used that the less instructed or scrupulous be not scandalised.

10. Instead of "him who hath knowledge," the great bulk of authorities read : "thou (or) who hast knowledge." Only B F G and the Vet. It. support the Vulgate. All the other authorities support the other reading.

"In an idol's temple." Estius and others, unwilling to believe that any Christian would sit down to eat in or at the idol's temple, hold that there is probably question merely of eating meats that had been sacrificed to idols. But the words are too clear to admit of such an explanation. Plainly the Apostle contemplates the case of a Christian who, because he was convinced that an idol had no power to defile, went so far as to partake of idolothytes at the very temple of the idol. How unworthy this was in itself, the Apostle will afterwards declare (x. 14 ff.) ; here he is satisfied with pointing out how calculated it was to give scandal. Εἰς ἰδωλεῖον in the LXX and in ecclesiastical writers means the temple or shrine of an idol, and it has the same meaning here. But as it was not usual to partake of the meats within the sacred house, but in the courts or grove attached, we may take it that St. Paul uses the word here as including, along with the sacred building, the courts and grove.

"Shall not his conscience, being weak." Our Version, following the Vulgate, refers "weak" to "conscience," but the true reading shows the meaning to be : "shall not the conscience of him who is weak" (αὐτοῦ ἀσθενούς), or : "shall not his conscience, if he is weak ?" etc.

"Be emboldened," etc. "Aedificare" and οἰκοδομεῖν used

candum idolothyta? ¹¹ Et peribit infirmus in tua scientia frater, propter quem Christus mortuus est? ¹² Sic autem peccantes in fratres et percutientes conscientiam eorum infirmam, in Christum peccatis. ¹³ Quapropter si esca scan-

which are sacrificed to idols? ¹¹ And through thy knowledge shall the weak brother perish, for whom Christ hath died? ¹² Now when you sin thus against the brethren, and wound their weak conscience, you sin against Christ. ¹³ Wherefore if

metaphorically have always elsewhere a good sense, that of edifying, promoting salvation (viii. 1; x. 23; xiv. 4, 17; 1 Thess. v. 11), so that the word is used here ironically. It is as if the Apostle said: See how the better instructed Christian discharges in such a case his duty of edifying others—he edifies them to do wrong! For the less instructed, seeing those who had knowledge eating at the idol's temple, would go on to do the same, while still doubting as to the liceity of their act.

11. "Shall perish" (ἀπολείναι) is not improbably correct, though most of the Protestant critics, on account of the authority of B and K, prefer to read the present ἀπόλλυνται. But the Vulgate has strong support in E F G L, and It., Syr., Arm., Aeth. versions.

The consequence of the scandal is very strongly put. A brother, a fellow-Christian to whom special charity is due, yea, a weak brother who ought to be treated with special tenderness, yea, a weak brother for whom Christ died, shall thus incur spiritual death through the ill-judged use of the knowledge of the better instructed.

It follows from the verse (a) that it is possible to fall away from the state of justice; (b) that a man may be lost for whom Christ died; hence Christ died for more than the elect; (c) that a man may sin mortally through an erroneous conscience, though the act wherein he sins is not in itself wrong.

12. "What more cruel," says St. Chrysostom, "than to wound the sick and weak?" And the same Father, commenting on this verse, says: "And how do they sin against Christ? (1) In one way, because the Lord regards as done to Himself what is done to His servants (Matt. xxv. 34 ff.); (2) because those who are wounded belong to His body and members; (3) because by their ostentation (i.e., their injudicious display of their knowledge) they pull down what Christ built up by His passion and death."

13. From the second person the Apostle suddenly changes to the first, expressing his own resolve to avoid all such scandal,

dalizat fratrem meum, non man-	meat scandalize my brother.
ducabo carnem in aeternum,	I will never eat flesh, lest I
ne fratrem meum scandalizem.	should scandalize my brother.

and at the same time intending his example to be a model for the Corinthians. *Ἐρῶσα* ("esca") is any food, anything that nourishes. *Κρέα* ("carnem," which ought to be "carnea," as *κρέα* is a contracted plural) is the flesh of animals.

The statement, according to Estius, is general, and not restricted to flesh that had been offered to idols: If by my eating flesh my brother is scandalized, then I will eat no flesh for ever, whether it was offered to idols or not. In a word since, as shown, the sin of scandal is so grievous, striking at Christ Himself, I will avoid scandal, however great the sacrifice it may cost me.

This passage proves the enormity of the sin of scandal. See also Matt. xviii. 6; Mark ix. 41; Luke xvii. 2. It also proves that we may be bound through charity to abstain from things perfectly lawful in themselves for fear of scandal. *Σκόνδαλον* (in classical Greek *σκονδάλιον*), from which the verb is derived, was properly a piece of wood or metal on which the bait was laid in a trap, then a snare of any kind, a stumbling block thrown in one's way, an occasion of falling.

CHAPTER IX

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

St. Paul claims that he is a genuine Apostle (vv. 1-3), and as such has a right to support without being obliged to labour for it (4-14); yet in order not to place any obstacle to the spread of the Gospel, and in the hope of a greater reward, he had not pressed, nor does he wish now to press, his right (15-18). Not only had he renounced his rights as Apostle, but he had made himself the slave of all men in order to gain them (19-22). And his ultimate motive in all this was that he might promote the spread of the Gospel, and secure his own salvation (23). Then he exhorts the Corinthians so to run that they may attain the prize, the incorruptible crown, of eternal life, proposing to them his own example of earnest struggle and severe austerity undergone through fear of losing otherwise his eternal reward (24-27).

<p>¹ Non sum liber ? Non sum apostolus ? Nonne CHRISTUM IESUM Dominum nostrum vidi ? Nonne opus meum vos estis in</p>	<p>¹ Am not I free ? Am not I an apostle ? Have not I seen CHRIST JESUS our Lord ? Are not you my work in the Lord ?</p>
--	---

1. This chapter is closely connected with the preceding. In the end of the previous chapter, the Apostle has just told the Corinthians that before they partake of meats that had been offered to idols, they must consider whether there is any danger of scandalising weaker brethren—in other words, that they may sometimes be bound for the sake of their neighbour to abstain from things lawful in themselves. And now in the present chapter, he shows how he himself, though an Apostle, and as such entitled to support from the churches, had abstained from exercising his right, and this for the sake of others, and in order that he might place no obstacle to the spread of the Gospel.

“Am not I free ? Am not I an Apostle ?” Some early authorities invert the order of these clauses, but there is hardly room for a doubt as to its correctness.

In the first clause, the Apostle claims the general freedom of a Christian, to which point he returns in vv. 19-22 ; in the second, he claims the dignity of Apostle, and as consequent upon it the

Domino ? * Et si aliis non sum * And if unto others I be not
 apostolus, sed tamen vobis sum : an apostle, but yet to you I
 nam signaculum apostolatus am. For you are the seal of my

right to support from the churches which an Apostle enjoyed. He then takes the second point first ; and since his claim to be a genuine Apostle, and to a right to support from the churches, might be disputed, he proves the first up to the end of verse 3 and the second in verses 4-14.

Hence the last two clauses of the present verse : " Have not I seen Jesus (omit ' Christ ') our Lord ? Are not you my work in the Lord ? " are meant to prove the truth of his claim to true Apostleship. To have seen Jesus risen from the dead, was a necessary qualification for an Apostle (see Acts i. 21-22), and hence St. Paul reminds the Corinthians of what he had no doubt told them before in his preaching, that this condition was fulfilled in himself. But since not everyone who saw Christ risen from the dead was an Apostle, but only those who were deputed for the work by Christ, more is implied here than is stated. The Apostle had no doubt told the Corinthians, during his eighteen months' stay among them while he was founding their Church, all about Christ's appearance to him on the way to Damascus and the commission then given him to preach the Gospel (Acts xxvi. 15-18 ; ix. 17 ; xxii. 14 ff.). Hence the allusion now to his having seen Christ was enough to recall also the commission to preach. Another proof that he was a true Apostle was supplied by the existence of the Corinthian Church. He seems to claim that the efficacy of his preaching in Corinth was evidence that God was with him and that he was the herald of Christ.

" In the Lord " is taken by many to mean : the Lord co-operating. The words would then be added by the Apostle lest he should be thought to claim the conversion of the Corinthians as his own work, independently of the grace of Christ. Others, and especially many moderns, prefer to understand : are not you in the Lord, i.e., you as Christians incorporated with Christ, my work ?

2. Omit " and." The sense is : if there be some who because I have never preached to them may refuse to recognise me as a true Apostle, yet you surely cannot do so, for you yourselves are, as it were, the seal (σφραγίς) that proves the genuineness of my Apostleship. There is the same diversity of view about " in the Lord " here as in the preceding verse.

mei vos estis in Domino. ³ Mea defensio apud eos qui me interrogant, hæc est.

⁴ Numquid non habemus potestatem manducandi et bibendi? ⁵ Numquid non habemus potestatem mulierem

apostleship in the Lord. ³ My defence with them that do examine me is this.

⁴ Have not we power to eat and to drink? ⁵ Have we not power to carry about a woman,

3. This is probably to be connected with what precedes. To those who might challenge his claim to Apostleship he has replied by pointing to the Corinthian Church which he had founded, and which by the abundance of graces bestowed upon it proved that God was with him (cf. 2 Cor. iii. 2).

4. Having asserted his claim to Apostleship, he now proceeds to show that, as an Apostle, he had a right to support without working for it. The whole context down to v. 14 shows that the words: "have we not power to eat and to drink?" mean: have we not the right to do so at the expense of those to whom we preach?

5. "Have we not power to bring about a woman, a sister, etc.?" The Revised Version translates "a wife that is a believer." Now, whatever be the meaning of the words, this translation is bad, for it is undeniable that the Greek word *γυνή* is ambiguous, and may mean either woman (without reference to whether she is married or single) or wife. This being so, it is wrong in a translation to determine the word to the narrower sense, especially when that sense has both tradition and the context against it. Now, the Fathers commonly, both Greek—Clem. Alex., Theod., Theoph., Oec.; and Latin—Tert., Jer., Aug., Pel., Prim., Ambter., understand the Apostle to speak of the right of bringing about with him a woman who would support him from her means. Such women, we know from the Gospels (Matt. xxvii. 55; Luke viii. 1 ff.), accompanied our Lord Himself, and it was quite a usual thing, and a matter for neither scandal nor surprise for Jewish teachers to be accompanied by such. "As faithful women followed the Lord, providing the disciples with the sustenance they required, so some of the Apostles were attended by women of fervent faith, who hung upon their teaching and helped the work of the Gospel" (Theod.). And St. Jerome on Matt. xxvii. 55 says: "*Consuetudinis enim Judaicæ fuit nec ducebatur in culpam more gentis antiquo ut mulieres de substantia sua victum atque vestitum praeceptoribus ministrarent.*"

sororem circumducendi, sicut a sister, as well as the rest of
et ceteri apostoli, et fratres the apostles, and the brethren

And St. Augustine (*De mon. op. iv. 5*) having explained the present passage in the same way adds: "*Hoc quidam non intelligentes non sororem mulierem sed uxorem interpretati sunt. Fefellit eos verbi graeci ambiguitas, quod et uxor et mulier eodem verbo graece dicitur. Quamquam hoc ita posuerit Apostolus, ut falli non debuerint: quia neque mulierem tantummodo ait, sed sororem mulierem, neque ducendi sed circumducendi.*" Tradition is, therefore, absolutely against understanding the passage of a wife.

And the context is equally opposed to such a view. For the argument of the Apostle is, that while he might have claimed support from the churches or brought about with him a Christian lady of means who would contribute towards his maintenance, and thus be saved from the necessity of working (*v. 6*), he had foregone these rights (*v. 15*) in order not to place any possible obstacle to the spread of the Gospel. It is wholly improbable then that the Apostle speaks of a wife, and this appears still more clearly from the fact that there is no evidence to prove that the other Apostles brought wives about with them. Nay, St. Peter's confident declaration: "Behold, we have left *all things*, and have followed thee," especially when we take it in conjunction with our Lord's reply: "Amen, I say to you, there is no man that hath left house or parents or brethren *or wife** or children for the kingdom of God's sake," etc. implies that the Apostles did not bring wives around with them.

The words then mean: Have we not power to bring about a Christian woman to minister to us from her means? This being once admitted, it matters little whether we take *ἀδελφὴν γυναῖκα* to mean: "a woman as a sister" or "a Christian woman."

"As the rest of the Apostles and the brethren of the Lord and Cephas." Cephas, though included in the rest of the Apostles (and head of the Apostolic College), is mentioned separately for emphasis. Similarly the brethren of the Lord here referred to seem to have been Apostles. We will not stay to refute the heretical opinion of Helvidius (condemned in the Council of

* The words "or wife" are admitted by Protestant critics to be genuine in Luke xviii. 29, though rejected by them in the parallel passages of SS. Matt. and Mark.

Domini, et Cephas ? * Aut ego solus, et Barnabas, non habemus potestatem hoc operandi ? † Quis militat suis stipendiis unquam ? Quis plantat vineam, et de fructu eius non edit ? Quis pascit gregem, et de lacte

of the Lord, and Cephas ? * Or I only and Barnabas have not we power to do this ? † Who serveth as a soldier at any time, at his own charges ? Who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof ? Who feedeth a flock, and eateth

Lateran, 649 A.D.), that Joseph and Mary had children after the birth of our Lord, for this blasphemous heresy is rejected by the constant and universal tradition of the Church.

Four brethren of the Lord are mentioned in the Gospels, James, Joseph or Josès, Simon and Jude (Matt. xiii. 55 ; Mark vi. 3,) and three of them, James, Simon, and Jude, were probably Apostles. That James, the brother of the Lord, was an Apostle seems clear from Gal. i. 19 compared with Acts ix. 27, 28. He is commonly known as James the Less. It is also very probable that Simon and Jude were Apostles,* so that it is very likely it is these three who are referred to in the verse before us.

What was done by the Apostles, even by those among them who were our Lord's relatives, nay, by Cephas himself, their head, might the same, St. Paul asks, not have been done by himself and Barnabas ? Strictly speaking, St. Paul had the same right, but the practice, while it gave rise to no comment in the Apostles of the Jews, might have given scandal in the Apostle of the Gentiles.

6. Instead of " power to do this," the more probable reading means : " power to abstain from working " (*ἐξουσίαν μὴ ἐργάζεσθαι*). But this reading, which is adopted by all the Protestant critics, shows that, as we have already said, St. Paul has not been speaking in the preceding verse of the right to have or bring about a wife, but of the right to support without labouring for it with his hands. The mention of Barnabas shows that St. Paul and he, notwithstanding the separation in Acts xv. 35, were again working together. See also Col. iv. 10 ; 2 Tim. iv. 11.

7. The Apostle now proceeds to adduce six other arguments to show that he had the right to support without labouring for it with his hands.

- (1) He has proved it by the example of the other Apostles, 5-6.
- (2) He proves it by the common usage of mankind, 7.

* See my Commentary on The Gospel of St. John, vii. 3.

gregis non manducat ? * Numquid secundum hominem hæc dico ? An et lex hæc non dicit ? * Scriptum est enim in lege Moysi : Non alligabis os bovi trituranti. Numquid de bobus cura est Deo ? ¹⁰ An not of the milk of the flock ? * Speak I these things according to man ? Or doth not the law also say these things ? * For it is written in the Law of Moses : *Thou shalt not muzzle the mouth of the ox that treadeth out the corn.* Doth God take care for oxen ? ¹⁰ Or doth He

(3) From the Old Testament, 8-10.

(4) From reason and justice, 11.

(5) By an *argumentum ad hominem*, 12.

(6) From the example of the Jewish Priests, 13.

(7) By the authority of Christ Himself, 14.

In verse 7 he asks if soldier or husbandman or shepherd is obliged to work *gratis* or to support himself by other work than that of his own proper calling. As St. Chrysostom points out, the implied comparison of the Apostles with soldiers, husbandmen and shepherds indicates the dangers, labours, and ceaseless solicitude of the Apostolic care, while their remuneration is not to be the accumulation of wealth, but simply their support, which Paul chose to forego.

8. The preceding argument, based upon the reason and usage of mankind, is now followed by an appeal to revelation.

9. One common way of detaching the grain from the straw and chaff was to spread the sheaves upon a large threshing floor and make oxen walk over them. The Mosaic law forbade the muzzling of these oxen. It is clear from this verse, as well as from 1 Tim. v. 17, 18, that in its higher and chief sense the prohibition was meant to forbid depriving the human labourer of his support. From our Apostle's question : " Doth God take care for oxen ? " or better : " Is it for the oxen that God careth ? " we are not to conclude that the Providence of God does not extend even to the oxen. Our Blessed Lord Himself says : " Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing ? And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father " (Matt. x. 29). " Neque enim de generali providentia agitur, qua Deus omnes etiam minimas res curat et ad fines eis propositos adducit, sed de speciali, qua creaturae rationales etiam positivis legibus ad fines suos diriguntur " (Corn.).

10. " Or doth he say this indeed (' by all means ') for our

propter nos utique hoc dicit ? Nam propter nos scripta sunt : quoniam debet in spe, qui arat, arare : et qui triturat, in spe fructus percipiendi. ¹¹ Si nos vobis spiritualia seminavimus, magnum est si nos carnalia vestra metamus ? ¹² Si alii potestatis vestrae participes sunt, quare non potius nos ? sed non usi sumus hac potestate : sed omnia sustinemus, ne quod offendiculum demus evangelio Christi. ¹³ Nescitis quoniam qui in sacrario operantur, quae de sacrario sunt edunt : et qui altari deserviunt,

say this indeed for our sakes ? For *these things* are written for our sakes ; that he that ploweth should plow in hope : and he that thrasheth, in hope to receive fruit. ¹¹ If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we reap your carnal things ? ¹² If others be partakers of this power over you ; why not we rather ? Nevertheless we have not used this power : but we bear all things, lest we should give any hindrance to the gospel of Christ. ¹³ Know you not that they who work in the holy place eat the things that are of the holy place ; and they that serve the altar partake

sakes ? " Here the Apostle signifies what was the motive of this prohibition. "Οτι (" quoniam ") we prefer to take as " because," and the sense is : Yea, for our sakes it was written, because he that ploweth, etc. In the end of the verse the true Greek reading is ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι τοῦ μετέχειν, " in the hope of participating."

11. He appeals to their sense of justice, whether in return for the spiritual blessings he brought them he had not a right to support.

12. " If others be partakers of this power over you," etc. It is hard to say whether the " others " alluded to were pseudo-apostles or genuine teachers like Apollos. In either case, the founder of the church had an *a fortiori* right.

Then he adds that he and Barnabas had not used this power while preaching to the Corinthians, lest, by requiring support, they should place any obstacle to the spread of the Gospel. This is thrown in here parenthetically and is developed in v. 15 ff.

13. " They who work in the holy place " (Gr. : " they who perform the sacred functions ") were the Jewish priests. No doubt the Levites also were engaged about the temple, still we believe the reference here is to the priests. In the next clause, " they that serve the altar," is in apposition to " they who

cum altari participant ? ¹⁴ Ita et Dominus ordinavit iis qui evangelium annunciant, de evangelio vivere.

¹⁵ Ego autem nullo horum usus sum. Non autem scripsi hæc ut ita fiant in me : bonum est enim mihi magis mori, quam ut gloriam meam quis evacuet. ¹⁶ Nam si evangelizavero, non est mihi gloria : necessitas enim

with the altar ? ¹⁴ So also the Lord ordained that they who preach the gospel should live by the gospel.

¹⁵ But I have used none of these things. Neither have I written these things, that they should be so done unto me : for it is good for me to die, rather than that any man should make my glory void. ¹⁶ For if I preach the gospel, it is no

perform the sacred functions," as is implied by the absence in the original of the connecting particle, "and" ("et") being spurious. To "partake with the altar" means that a portion was burned upon the altar in sacrifice, while a portion went to the priests for their use. See e.g., Num. xviii ; Deut. x ; xviii, etc.

14. As by God's direction the priests of the Old Law were to have their support in view of their priestly duties, so Christ ordained that the Apostles of the New Law should have the right of support without working for it with their hands (Matt. x. 10 ; Luke x. 7). Plainly, as his own action proves, our Apostle supposes that they were not bound to exercise the right, though the faithful are bound by Christ's ordinance to admit it. "The Apostle does not mention the Christian altar in contrast with the Jewish altar, because he is speaking of the remuneration due not precisely to the sacerdotal, but to the Apostolic office ; and the first work of an Apostle is to preach and make converts, and to teach his people the truths of the Gospel" (Rickaby).

15. "But I have used none of these things," i.e., these many arguments to enforce my right.—"Neither have I written." Ἐγὼ οὐκ is here the epistolary aorist ; at the time the letter was received the action referred to was past (cf. Acts xxiii. 30 ; Phil. ii. 28). It would be better to read "fiat" instead of the Vulgate "fiant." In the end of the verse, "my glory" should rather be "my glorying" (καύχημα). He means that it would be good for him rather to die than that anyone should deprive him of glorying in having preached the Gospel *gratis* to the Corinthians.

16. He goes on to point out that he had no matter for glorying in the fact that he preached the Gospel, for he was under obligation

mihi incumbit : vae enim mihi est, si non evangelizavero. ¹⁷ Si enim volens hoc ago, mercedem habeo : si autem invitus, dispensatio mihi credita est.

glory to me : for a necessity lieth upon me : for woe is unto me if I preach not the gospel. ¹⁷ For if I do this thing willingly I have a reward : but if against my will, a dispensation is com-

to do so. Christ had commanded him to preach (i. 17 ; Rom. i. 14 ; Acts xxvi. 16 ff. ; xxii. 21), and hence he says : " Woe is unto me if I preach not."

17. The meaning of this verse has been much disputed. We shall first state what we believe to be the meaning. The Apostle is pointing out in the passage that preaching being in his case a work of obligation gives no right to a special reward and affords no matter for glorying, because in such case he does only that to which he is bound. But preaching *gratis* being a matter of supererogation, to which he is not bound, gives right to a special reward and affords matter for glorying.

In this view, which is that commonly held by the Greeks, ἐκὼν, which is rendered in the Vulgate by " volens," means *spontaneously*, or not bound by a precept to do so, while ἄκων means not spontaneously, but under necessity (v. 16), arising from a precept to do so. Thus the sense of the verse is : For if I preach without being bound to do so, I have a claim to a special reward, but if I preach being bound by precept to do so, then I am intrusted with a stewardship which I merely discharge, and I have no claim to any special reward (See Luke xvii. 10). Of course, even those who preach, while under obligation to do so, shall receive their proper reward, and the Apostle takes this for granted (iii. 8), but the next verse here shows that the reward of which the Apostle is now speaking is a special reward due not to preaching, but to preaching *gratis*. In this view the verse affords an argument for the existence and merit of works of supererogation.

Estius and many of the Latins take a different view of the verse. They hold that the Apostle is not speaking of a special reward but of the ordinary reward of a faithful preacher. Ἐκὼν (" volens ") they explain to mean : from a proper motive and with good dispositions ; ἄκων (" invitus ") from a bad motive or with bad dispositions, and the last words of the verse : " I am intrusted with a stewardship," are added, they hold, to signify that even the imperfect preacher is not to be despised, because

¹⁸ Quæ est ergo merces mea ? ut Evangelium prædicans, sine sumptu ponam evangelium, ut non abutar potestate mea in evangelio. ¹⁹ Nam cum liber essem ex omnibus, omnium me

mitted to me. ¹⁸ What is my reward then ? That preaching the gospel, I may deliver the gospel without charge, that I abuse not my power in the gospel. ¹⁹ For whereas I was

what he preaches is not his own but God's, whose Gospel he preaches.

Thus then the whole verse would mean : For if from a proper motive and with good dispositions I preach the Gospel, I have a reward (the reward of every good preacher) (iii. 8, 14), but if from a bad motive or with bad dispositions, even then I am the steward of God commissioned to dispense His Mysteries, and my teaching is not to be despised.

But, not to speak of the unnatural sense thus thrust upon *ἰκόν* and *ἔκων*, the verse in this view is out of joint with the context. In our view, on the contrary, it fits in naturally. The Apostle forebore to urge his right to live by the Gospel, nor does he wish even now to insist upon that right lest he should be deprived of the one matter for glorying that was peculiar to him in comparison with the other Corinthian teachers (v. 15). For the mere preaching of the Gospel to which he was bound, was no matter for glorying (v. 16). For if he preached, not bound by any precept to do so, he should have a right to a special reward (and matter for glorying), but if, as was the fact, bound by precept to do so, then he merely discharged the stewardship intrusted to him (v. 17). His claim to a special reward, therefore, lay not in preaching, but in preaching *gratis* (v. 18) ; and all this was a lesson to the Corinthians, showing them that some things lawful in themselves, as meats that had been offered to idols, should be renounced, as he had renounced in Corinth his right to live by the Gospel, for the sake of a greater good.

18. "Reward" is put here, by metonymy, for that to which the reward is due : What then is my claim to a special reward ? And he replies : this, namely (*ἵνα* being explanatory), that preaching the Gospel I may deliver the Gospel without charge, so as not to *use to the full* (for this sense of *καταχρησασθαι*, see on vii. 31) my right in the Gospel.

19. In the end of 18 he has insinuated that not merely in the matter of support, but generally, he had not used to the full his right in the Gospel, that is, the rights that belonged to him

servum feci, ut plures lucrifacerem. ²⁰ Et factus sum Iudæis tanquam Iudæus, ut Iudæos lucrarer: ²¹ Iis qui sub lege sunt, quasi sub lege essem (cum ipse non essem sub

free as to all, I made myself the servant of all, that I might gain the more. ²⁰ And I became to the Jews a Jew, that I might gain the Jews: ²¹ To them that are under the law, as if I

through his being a preacher of the Gospel. He now proceeds to show that this was so. For whereas as a divine legate he was free as to all men, "subject to no man in any respect" (St. Chrysostom), yet he made himself the servant or slave of all, conforming to their wishes, as a slave to his master's, in order that he might gain "the more," i.e., more than he would have gained if he had not made himself the slave of all.

20. He goes on to show how he made himself the slave of all by accommodating himself to Jews and Gentiles and weak Christians.

21. "Those under the law" are the Jews and proselytes to Judaism, so that this clause explains the preceding and shows that in saying he had become a Jew to the Jews, he spoke of Jews by religion, whether they were Jews by race or Gentiles who had become proselytes to Judaism. A Jew by race St. Paul did not need to, and could not, become, for he was born such.

The "law" here is clearly the law of Moses, as in Rom. ii. 14. The Apostle means that he acted as though he were still under the Mosaic law, in order that he might win the Jews, who still recognised it. Thus we know he circumcised Timothy on account of the Jews (Acts xvi. 3), and for a similar reason co-operated in legal ceremonies at the temple in Jerusalem (Acts xxi. 23-26).

On the other hand, with the Gentiles who were without the Mosaic law (Rom. ii. 14), he acted as one who did not recognise that law. But lest it should be inferred that he lived like the Gentiles, observing no law, he adds that he was not without the law of God, but in the law of Christ. And the law of Christ imposes the moral precepts of the Mosaic law, since the whole moral law is summed up in the precept of charity: "For the whole law is fulfilled in one word: Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself" (Gal. v. 14; cf. Rom. xiii. 8-10).

Estius argues from this verse that because being under the law of Christ means being under the law of God, therefore to St. Paul, Christ is God. But, as Cornely points out, being under the law of Moses meant being under the law of God, though

lege), ut eos qui sub lege erant, lucrificerem : iis qui sine lege erant, tanquam sine lege essem (cum sine lege Dei non essem : sed in lege essem Christi), ut lucrificerem eos qui sine lege erant. ¹² Factus sum infirmis infirmus, ut infirmos lucrificerem. Omnibus omnia factus sum, ut omnes facerem salvos. ¹³ Omnia autem facio propter evangelium, ut particeps eius efficiar.

were under the law, (whereas myself was not under the law), that I might gain them that were under the law. To them that were without the law, as if I were without the law, (whereas I was not without the law of God, but was in the law of Christ), that I might gain them that were without the law. ¹² To the weak I became weak, that I might gain the weak. I became all things to all men that I might save all. ¹³ And I do all things for the gospel's sake : that I may be made partaker thereof.

Moses was but a man. Hence the argument is not conclusive ; but Christ's Divinity is proclaimed on almost every page of the New Testament.

22. The " weak " are most probably Christians, weak in the faith and easily scandalized (cf. Rom. xiv.), who were to be gained not absolutely because they were already Christians, but led on to a fuller knowledge and a firmer faith. Some, however, understand by the " weak " the more ignorant of the unconverted Jews and Gentiles.

Instead of : " I became all things to all men, that I might save all," read : " I am become (γέγονα) all things to all men, that I may by all means save *some* " (ἵνα πάντας τινὰς σώσω—the reading of almost all Greek MSS. and of the VV. other than the Latin). The Greek reading throws into bolder relief the charity of the Apostle, who laboured so incessantly and unselfishly, though he could only hope to save some.

23. By the Gospel is here meant the Gospel promises. The Gospel doctrines he already possessed ; but for sake of the rewards promised in the Gospel, in order to be a partaker together with his converts (συγκοινωνός) in those rewards, he was spending himself in the service of Christ and performing works even of supererogation. If St. Paul could thus labour with a view to reward, no wonder the Council of Trent defined : " Si quis dixerit justificatum peccare dum intuitu aeternae mercedis bene operatur, anathema sit " (Sess. vi, Can. 31). This verse introduces a new

²⁴ Nescitis quod ii qui in stadio currunt, omnes quidem currunt, sed unus accipit bravium? Sic currite ut comprehendatis. ²⁵ Omnis autem qui in agone contendit, ab omnibus se abstinere: et illi quidem ut corruptibilem coronam accipiant, nos autem incorruptam. ²⁶ Ego igitur sic curro, non quasi in incertum: sic pugno, non quasi aërem

²⁴ Know you not that they that run in the race, all run indeed, but one receiveth the prize? So run that you may obtain. ²⁵ And everyone that striveth for the mastery refraineth himself from all things: and they indeed that they may receive a corruptible crown: but we an incorruptible one. ²⁶ I therefore so run, not as at an uncertainty: I so fight, not as one beating

thought; hitherto he has spoken of his labour and self-denial as undergone for the sake of others, but now also for his own sake.

24. To urge the Corinthians to follow his example, he reminds them that it is not enough to be Christians. The language is metaphorical, in allusion probably to the Isthmian games which were celebrated every second or third year close to Corinth. In the Greek games the prize was a garland of leaves, usually of the pine or olive. It is to this the Apostle refers in "bravium," which is merely a Latin transliteration of the Greek βραβεῖον.

"So run that you may obtain." "So," i.e., like the one who receiveth the prize, in order that you may obtain the eternal prize destined for you.

25. Here he shows how we ought to mortify ourselves in order that we may secure our eternal crown. And everyone that striveth in the games is temperate in all things (πάντα ἐγκρατεύειν); now they (act so) that they may receive a corruptible crown of fading leaves, but we an incorruptible one. In the last clause something is to be supplied, e.g., but we look forward to an incorruptible one, or: Let us do likewise that we may gain an incorruptible one.

26. Since I strive for a crown that is incorruptible, "I therefore so run, not as at an uncertainty" (Gr.: "as not uncertainly"). A comparison with the next clause seems to show that the sense is: I direct all my efforts towards the goal, I do not run at random, I run to the purpose. He means that the greatness of the prize stimulated him to earnest and well directed effort, and this, of course, is meant as an exhortation to the Corinthians to do likewise. In the words: "I so fight ('box') as not beating

verberans : " Sed castigo corpus meum, et in servitutem redigo : ne forte cum aliis prædicaverim, ipse reprobus efficiar.

the air : " But I chastise my body, and bring it into subjection : lest perhaps, when I have preached to others, I myself should become a cast-away.

the air," we have a new metaphor, alluding to the pugilistic contests in the Greek games.

27. Having shown how he does *not* fight, he now shows how he does. His adversary is his own body, and this he chastises and subdues. For ὑπωμίζω (" I chastise "), supported by B ■ A C D, some other authorities read ὑπομάζω (" I subject "). Ὑπωμίζω means primarily to bruise that part of the face which is under the eyes (ὕψωμα), then to bruise, to beat black and blue. Here in regard to his body, the Apostle uses the word in reference to corporal austerities. In the words : " and bring it into subjection " (or bondage), there is still allusion to the prize ring in which the victor led his vanquished adversary round the arena like his slave.

" Lest perhaps," etc. We think it most likely that there is still allusion to the games. The herald of the Greek games who announced the contests and proclaimed the conditions, was a κήρυξ, and hence the Apostle very probably means : lest after I have acted the herald in calling others to this spiritual combat and pointing out to them the conditions of the contest (κηρύξας), I myself should become a castaway (ἀδόκιμος). In the spiritual contest the Apostle was not only a herald, but also a competitor, and he tells us here that he chastised his body, practising austerities, lest he should be excluded from the prize. Could there be any clearer evidence of the spiritual utility of corporal austerities ?

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Corinthians ought to be warned by the terrible fate that befell the Jews of the Exodus, who though they all received a typical baptism, and were fed with miraculous food and drink (as Christians are in the Blessed Eucharist), yet fell into various sins and perished in the desert almost to a man (vv. 1-14). Practical solution of questions regarding the eating of meats offered to idols: (a) of partaking of such meats at the sacrificial banquets of the heathens (15-22), (b) of partaking of them on ordinary occasions at a private table (x. 22-xi. 1).

¹ NOLO enim vos ignorare ¹ FOR I would not have you
fratres, quoniam patres nostri ignorant, brethren, that our
omnes sub nube fuerunt, et fathers were all under the

1. This and the following verses are closely connected with the close of the preceding chapter. The Apostle has indicated the possibility of his becoming a castaway, thereby of course implying the same possibility in the case of the Corinthians, and now to drive this home, he recalls how all the Jews of the Exodus were made partakers of most special divine favours, yet with the most of them God was afterwards displeased.

The "fathers" are the Jews of the Exodus, who were the carnal as well as spiritual fathers of St. Paul and the Jewish Christians at Corinth, and the spiritual fathers of the Gentile Christians there. For as "they who are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham" (Gal. iii. 7), so are they in some sense the children of those Jews of the Exodus, whose faith before they fell away was rewarded by such mighty miracles. "The cloud" not only directed their course (Exod. xiii. 31), but covered and protected them (Exod. xiv. 19 ff.; Num. xiv. 14; Ps. civ. 39; Wisd. x. 17; xix. 7), so that they could all be said to have been *under* the cloud. As the cloud appeared before the passage of the Red Sea (Exod. xiii. 21; xiv. 19 ff.), the Apostle, following the chronological order, mentions it first.

The Apostle's idea is to show that all the Jews of the Exodus shared in God's most special favours, and he selects for mention

omnes mare transierunt : ¹ Et omnes in Moyse baptizati sunt, in nube, et in mari : ² Et omnes eandem escam spiritalem man- cloud, and all passed through the sea. ¹ And all in Moses were baptized, in the cloud, and in the sea : ² And did all

such favours as were typical of the two greatest Sacraments of the New Law : Baptism, which is the most necessary, and the Blessed Eucharist, which is the most excellent. In effect, what he says (vv. 2-4) is : they all received a typical baptism, and all a typical communion, yet, etc.

2. Christian Baptism is through water and the Holy Ghost, as instrumental and principal efficient causes (John iii. 5) ; now in the case of the Jews of the Exodus, the Holy Ghost was typified by the cloud, the water of Baptism by the sea. " Nubes," says St. Thomas, " erat symbolum Spiritus, mare vero symbolum aquae." Hence the Apostle, in this verse, points out the meaning and significance of the historical events which he has recalled in verse 1.

Instead of Vulgate " in Moyse," read " in Moysen " (ἐν τῷ Μωϋσῃ). The meaning of this cannot be that, through Moses or under the guidance of Moses, they were baptized, but as in i. 13, 15 ; Matt. xviii. 29 ; Acta viii. 16 ; xix. 3, 5 ; Rom. vi. 3 ; Gal. iii. 27, the sense is that they were thus formally placed under the leadership and guidance of Moses, and thus, as it were, initiated into the covenant of which he was soon after to be the mediator. So to be baptized " unto Christ " means to be placed under the leadership and headship of Christ, to become His follower (i. 13-15), to be initiated into the new covenant of which He is Mediator.

For ἐβαντίσμεντο (" submitted to baptism," " had themselves baptized ") which is read by B K L P, the passive ἐβαντίσθησαν is read by \aleph A C D E F G in agreement with the Vet. It. and the Vulgate " baptizati sunt."

3. Nor had they all merely a typical baptism in common ; they all had likewise a typical communion in common, for they had food and drink that typified the two species in the Blessed Eucharist. The " food " is, of course, the manna (Exod. xvi. 15), and this the Apostle calls spiritual (πνευματικόν) because it was supplied in a miraculous manner through the immediate intervention of God ; and also, perhaps, as many of the Fathers add, because it was *typical* of something to come, namely, of the true bread that cometh down from heaven (John vi. 35, 49, 50). In

ducaverunt, 'Et omnes eum- eat the same spiritual food,
dem potum spiritalem biberunt 'And all drank the same

saying they all eat the same spiritual food, he does not mean the same with us, but the same with each other. Though they all (note the "all" five times repeated in the first four verses, and then the sad contrast in verse 5) shared in the same great divine favours, yet the end of all was not alike. "Si dicam : omnes Hispani eundem habent regem, nec addam eum quibus eundem, utique significo eundem inter se" (Est.). Calvin, however, held the meaning to be that they eat the same food *with us*, and thus claimed to find here a confirmation of two of his favourite heresies : (1) that the Sacraments of the Old Law were equal in dignity to those of the New, and (2) that Christ is present only spiritually in the Eucharist as in the manna. It is true St. Augustine (on John, Tract 26, 12) held that they are said to have eaten the same food with us, but he means that the thing typified by what they eat was the same as what we eat, that though their corporal food and drink were different from ours, their spiritual food was the same. Thus on Psalm 77, n. 2, he says : "Idem in mysterio cibus et potus eorum, qui noster ; sed *significatione* idem, non *specie* ; quia idem ipse Christus illis in petra figuratus, nobis in carne manifestatus" ; and on Psalm 73, n. 2 : "Sacramenta Novi Test. *dant salutem*, sacramenta Vet. Test. *promiserunt Salvatorem*." Hence the holy Doctor's view differs *toto coelo* from that of Calvin.

4. Not only did all eat the same spiritual food, but all drank the same spiritual drink—spiritual in the sense that it was miraculously produced and probably also because it typified Christ's blood in the Eucharist. To prove that the drink was spiritual, or rather to prove that they all drank the same spiritual drink, he adds : "for (γάρ, 'enim' instead of the Vulg. 'autem') they used to drink of the spiritual rock that followed (them)."

In saying they all drank of the spiritual rock, does the Apostle speak of a material rock which was a type of Christ, or does he mean a metaphorical Rock which really was Christ ? Many take the latter view, and hold the sense to be that they drank of the water supplied at intervals by the *Verbum incarnandum*, who was identical with the *Verbum incarnatum*, or Jesus Christ. To understand this, it is to be noted that many of the Fathers held that the Son of God sometimes appeared during Old Testament times in the form of an angel ; and according to the present view

(bibebant autem de spiritali, spiritual drink, (and they drank consequente eos, petra : petra of the spiritual rock that

it was He who, in the form of an angel, led the Jews through the desert* (Exod. xxiii. 20-23 ; xxxii. 34). The water, then, which flowed on at least two occasions from the material rock (Exod. xvii. 6 ; Num. xx. 11) is held to have been provided by the spiritual Rock, namely, the Son of God, and according to the view we are setting forth, St. Paul says so here.

If it be objected that St. Paul would not refer to the *Verbum* as a Rock, it is replied that in various passages in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament—passages with which the Apostle must have been familiar—God is often so called, e.g., Deut. xxxii. 4, 15, 18 ; Is. xvii. 10 ; xxvi. 4,† etc. ; and ambiguity is held to be excluded in the present instance by the fact that the Apostle not only speaks of a spiritual Rock, but also declares that it was Christ. Thus, according to this view, St. Paul says that they all drank of the same spiritual drink, because they all drank of the water supplied by the spiritual Rock, the Son of God, who accompanied them on their journey. It is urged, too, that ἀκολουθούσης does not necessarily mean : “ that followed,” but only “ that accompanied ” them, so that there need be no difficulty, such as was felt by Estius, in understanding it of the Son of God in the form of an angel, who preceded the Jews through the desert. Hence St. Chrysostom on this verse, with most of the Greeks, says it was the spiritual Rock, Christ, who gave them the water. In this view, “ spiritual,” as applied to the Rock, cannot mean typical, but must mean spiritual in the highest and strictest sense, being applied to the *Verbum*, who is a pure Spirit.

Many take quite a different view of the passage. They hold that the rock referred to is the material rock, or rocks struck by Moses (Exod. xvii. 6 ; Num. xx. 11) ; that it is called “ spiritual ” on account of its typical character, inasmuch as it typified Christ, whose blood flowed, like the water of the rock, for the nourishment of mankind ; and that it is said to have “ followed ” the Jews either because, according to some, it rolled with them in their wanderings through the desert, or much more probably, according to others, because it followed or accompanied them in its effect, namely, in the water which flowed from it : “ He

* So Just., Iren., Clem., Alex., Tert., Cypr., Eus., Caes., Athan., Hil., Pict., Ambr., Cyr., Jerus., Chrys. Cf. Danko, *Historia Reuel. divinæ V.T.*, p. 220 ff. ; Steenk. on Acts, Append., Dissertatio II.

† All the passages, however, are poetical.

autem erat Christus): ⁴ Sed followed them, and the rock non in pluribus eorum bene- was Christ). ⁵ But with the placitum est Deo: nam pro- most of them God was not well

brought forth water out of the rock, and made streams run down as rivers," (Ps. lxxvii. 16; cf. Ps. civ. 41). There is, indeed, a very old Rabbinical fable that the rock, once struck, followed the camp, and daily supplied the people with water; but if so, how could the second want of water, mentioned in Num. xx. 1-13, have occurred? There is no need to believe that the rock rolled after the wanderers in the desert, nor that its stream followed them over hill and valley; it is enough if the miraculous stream supplied them until they came to a natural supply of water.

If this second view of the passage be adopted, then the statement: "and the rock was Christ," must be explained as meaning either that the thing signified by the rock was Christ, or that the rock was a type of Christ; that is, with a metaphor in either the subject or the predicate of the sentence, for here, as always, the substantive verb merely connects the subject and predicate. But even in this view, it does not follow because St. Paul could say that the rock was Christ, while in reality it was only a type of Christ, that our Lord could say: "This is my body" (Matt. xxvi. 26, etc.), though it were only a type or sign of His body, for both the language of the two statements, and the circumstances in which they were made, are entirely different. To say that a material rock was at one and the same time Christ, involves a contradiction in terms, and so a metaphor is at once suggested. But at the Last Supper Christ did not say: this *bread* is my body, but: "this is my body," merely pointing to the substance present, when the sentence was completed and the words had produced their effect, as His body. The circumstances, too, are quite different. The context here (τότοι, v. 6; τυτικῶς, v. 11) shows that the Apostle is speaking of things in the Old Law that were types of those in the New, and so we are prepared to understand that the spiritual rock was only a type of Christ, but there is nothing whatever in Christ's words spoken at the Last Supper or in the context of the Evangelists and St. Paul, who record them, or in the usage of human speech to show that the bread was merely a sign of Christ's body. On the contrary, Christ's discourse of a year before (John vi) must have prepared and forced the Apostles to understand Him literally.

5. Though all had experienced God's most special favours,

strati sunt in deserto. * Haec autem in figura facta sunt nostri, ut non simus concupiscentes malorum, sicut et illi concupierunt; * Neque idololatrae efficiamini, sicut quidam ex ipsis: quemadmodum scriptum est: Sedit populus manducare et bibere, et surrexerunt ludere. * Neque fornicemur,

pleased: for they were overthrown in the desert. * Now these things were done in a figure of us, that we should not covet evil things, as they also coveted. * Neither become ye idolaters, as some of them: as it is written: *The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play.* * Neither let us

yet with the majority of them (τοῖς πλείοσι) God was not well pleased, for they were overthrown in the desert. There is *meiosis* here, for God was terribly displeased, and of more than 600,000 men of twenty years old and upwards who left Egypt, only two, Josue and Caleb, lived to enter the Promised Land (Num. i. 46; xiv. 20 ff.; xxvi. 63 ff.).

6. The Revised Version renders: "Now these things were our examples," with a marginal alternative: "Now in these things they became figures of us." In the benefits bestowed upon them and in the punishments afterwards inflicted, they became a warning to us to the end that we of the New Testament should not covet ("be lusters after") evil things. Some take this, with St. Chrysostom, of avoiding sins generally; then the following verses specify some of the sins against which they are to be specially on their guard. Yet as the word ἐπιθυμητής, occurs only here in the New Testament, and in LXX, only in Num. xi. 34, where there is reference to the Jews who lusted for flesh in the desert, it is probable that there is allusion here to that incident. The Jews in the desert lusting for flesh (not forbidden in itself but only in the circumstances) were a warning to the Corinthians lusting for meats offered to idols.

7. The form in which this verse opens: "neither be ye" (μὴ ᾤε) confirms our view that there is reference in the preceding to a special sin. They are now warned against another, idolatry. The reference here is to Exod. xxxii. 6, when some of the people sacrificed and feasted and danced before the golden calf. From the fact that the dancing is mentioned, it is clear that it was in honour of the idol, and therefore idolatry. Tertullian thinks more than dancing is meant: "Intellige Scripturae verecundiam, lusum nisi impudicum non denotasset" (*De jej.*, 6).

8. The reference seems to be to Num. xxv. 1 ff., where the people sinned with the daughters of Moab, who had invited them

sicut quidam ex ipsis fornicati sunt, et ceciderunt una die viginti tria millia. * Neque tentemus Christum : sicut quidam eorum tentaverunt, et a serpentibus perierunt.

commit fornication, as some of them committed fornication, and there fell in one day three and twenty thousand. * Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them tempted, and perished by

to their sacrifices. In Num., however, the number slain on that occasion is said to have been *four* and twenty thousand. The best explanation of this difficulty is to suppose that St. Paul wrote *twenty-four* thousand, but that this was very clearly changed to *twenty-three* thousand. The Greek for four being τέσσαρες, and for three τρεῖς, if St. Paul's amanuensis or some early copyist wrote τέσσαρες in its contracted form τρεῖς, this might easily be taken for τρεῖς, and so the error could readily arise.

Another explanation, which is not improbable, is that St. Paul speaks of the number that fell *in one day*, whereas Num. speaks of the number that fell on the *occasion*, but not all on the same day. Either of these explanations is better than to attempt to explain by saying that St. Paul's lesser number is contained in the greater, or that the true number lay between twenty-three and twenty-four thousand, or that the reference here is not to the sins committed with the women of Moab (Num. xxv.), but that St. Paul is still speaking of the sins committed before the golden calf on the occasion referred to in the preceding verse. It is true that in Exod. xxxii. 28 the Vulgate gives the number slain in punishment of the worship of the golden calf as twenty-three thousand, and if we could regard this reading as correct we should certainly take St. Paul as referring to that occasion. But that reading of the Vulgate is most probably wrong, for the Heb., LXX, and the other ancient VV. have in Exod. xxxii. 28 not twenty-three but *three* thousand.

9. Instead of "the Christ," B X C P, 17, Aeth., Arm. versions read "the Lord" (τὸν Κύριον), and A has God (τὸν θεόν) but the Vulgate is supported by the Vet. It., Syr. and Copt. versions, as well as by D E F G K L. The sense of the Vulgate is : nor let us tempt the "Verbum incarnatum," as they did the "Verbum incarnandum." If we read "the Lord," it is disputed whether the reference is to Christ or Jehovah ; St. Epiphanius says, that Marcion changed Κύριον into Χριστόν to remove the argument for the Lordship of Christ. In Num. xxi. 5, 6, to which the Apostle alludes, we read : "And the people spoke against God

¹⁰ Neque murmuraveritis, sicut quidam eorum murmuraverunt, et perierunt ab exterminatore. ¹¹ Haec autem omnia in figura contingebant illis : scripta sunt autem ad correptionem nostram the serpents. ¹⁰ Neither do you murmur, as some of them murmured, and were destroyed by the destroyer. ¹¹ Now all these things happened to them in figure : and they are written

and against Moses : Wherefore have you brought us up out of Egypt to die in the wilderness ? for there is no bread, and there is no water, and our soul loatheth this light food. Wherefore the Lord sent fiery serpents among the people."

The temptation in question, then, seems to have been a dissatisfaction with their condition in the desert, and a want of faith in God's continued care. Against such sins, therefore, the Corinthians are warned.

10. As the Jews in the desert murmured frequently, it is uncertain to what occasion there is reference here. Most probably the reference is to the occasion mentioned in Num. xvi, when after Core and Dathan and Abiron had been swallowed up by the earth (vv. 31, 32), " all the multitude of the children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron, saying : You have killed the people of the Lord " (v. 41). And though we are told in that passage of Num. that the people were punished by a plague, not by " the destroyer," yet the writer of Wisdom referring to that occasion uses the very term we have here, " the destroyer " (ὁ ὀλοθραυτής). Wisd. xviii. 25. The plague was doubtless caused by an angel. Cf. Exod. xii. 23 ; 2 Kings xxiv. 16 ; 1 Paral. xxi. 12.

The allusion here, then, seems meant as a warning to the Corinthians not to murmur against their superiors, as some of them were perhaps already murmuring against our Apostle himself.

11. " In figure " (τυπικῶς, not τύποι), i.e., their sins and consequent punishments were a type of what may befall us. The imperfect συνέβαινεν signifies that the things referred to did not happen together, but one after another through a period. For " correction " read rather " admonition " (cf. iv. 14).

" Upon whom the ends of the world are come." The Greek would be better rendered : " unto whom the ends of the ages have reached." The ages seem to be the successive periods in the religious history of humanity. What is meant by " the ends of the ages," is not clear. Some understand of the varied fulfilment in Christian times of the figures of previous ages.

in quos fines saeculorum de-
 nerunt. ¹² Itaque qui se existi-
 mat stare, videat ne cadat.
¹³ Tentatio vos non apprehendat
 nisi humana: fidelis autem

for our correction, upon whom
 the ends of the world are come.
¹² Wherefore he that thinketh
 himself to stand, let him take
 heed lest he fall. ¹³ Let no
 temptation take hold on you,

Others take the reference to be to various periods of the Messianic age, which are to be the ends (τὰ τέλη) of the ages, never to be succeeded themselves by any other religious dispensation. Estius says: "Hoc autem tempus est decurrentis ecclesiae, quo implendae sunt figurae priorum temporum. Loquitur enim Apostolus non tantum in persona fidelium sui temporis, sed et eorum, qui post futuri erant usque ad finem saeculi."

12. Since the Jews of the Exodus, who had been so favoured by God, fell away, "So then let him," etc. Only one who is standing can fall, and hence the Apostle does not speak of one who merely fancies he is standing, while in reality he is not. But the expression, "thinketh himself to stand," is probably used to imply that one cannot be absolutely certain of one's justification. "Quilibet, dum seipsum suamque propriam infirmitatem et indispositionem respicit, de sua gratia formidare et timere potest; cum nullus scire valeat certitudine fidei, cui non potest subesse falsum, se gratiam Dei esse consecutum." Council of Trent, Sess. vi., *De Justif.*, Cap. 9. Whether the fall be a complete and final falling away from God or, as is more probable, into mortal sin, this verse affords a clear proof that the state of justification can be lost.

13. Instead of: "Let no temptation take hold on you, but such as is human," we must read: "No temptation *hath taken* hold on you," etc., for the perf. εἰληφεν is read by almost all the Greek MSS. and Fathers and is supported by nearly all the Versions, and even by many Latin authorities.

Various views have been held as to the bearing of the first clause of the verse. St. Chrysostom holds that the Apostle is reminding his readers that they must not be too confident of not falling from the fact that they have stood firm in the past, and the reason is because they have not yet been severely tried. But we prefer to regard the whole of this verse as meant for encouragement and consolation. It is as if the Apostle said: Be not alarmed and disheartened by the sad and terrible examples I have put before you; in the past no insuperable temptation

<p>Deus est, qui non patietur vos tentari supra id quod potestis, sed faciet etiam cum tentatione proventum ut possitis sustinere.</p>	<p>but such as is human. And God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able : but will make also with temptation issue, that you may be able to bear it.</p>
--	--

has taken hold on you, and as to the future, God is faithful, who will not allow you to be tempted above that which you are able.

"Human" (ἀνθρώπινος) put here in contrast with "above that which you are able," means proportioned to human strength, such as man, aided by God's grace, can overcome without any superhuman effort (Cf. Rom. vi. 19).

Because "God is faithful" He may be relied upon to continue the good work He has begun in you by calling you to faith and grace ; He will therefore not suffer you to be tempted above that which you are able, but will with the temptation make also *the way of escape* so that you may be able to endure. Τοῦ δύνανθαι—the τοῦ with the infinitive may be taken here either as expressing a purpose : *to the end* that ye may be able to endure or a consequence : *so that* you may be able to endure. Or some prefer to hold that it is the genitive of the substantival infinitive, depending on ἔκβασιν : the way of escape of being able to endure, the power of endurance constituting the way of escape. Note that it is only the *power* of endurance that is given ; to reduce that power to act depends upon ourselves.

From the form of the Apostle's words : "with (or together with) the temptation," it is legitimately inferred that the moment the temptation urges grace is immediately present.

From the verse it follows clearly that sufficient grace to resist temptation is promised to some at least of the Corinthians. But to whom precisely does the Apostle speak ? Not certainly to the elect only, as Estius contends. For this Epistle is written to all the faithful of Corinth, and who shall say that they were all elect ? Besides, no mortal knows, without a special revelation, whether he is among the number of the elect, and hence if St. Paul spoke here only to the elect, none of the Corinthians could know whether the words had any application to himself. But the object of the Apostle evidently is to console and encourage those whom he may have terrified by the preceding examples and warning, that is, all the faithful of Corinth.

¹⁴ Propter quod, charissimi mihi, fugite ab idolorum cultura. ¹⁵ Ut prudentibus loquor, vos ipsi iudicate quod dico. ¹⁴ Wherefore, my dearly beloved, fly from the service of idols. ¹⁵ I speak as to wise men : judge ye yourselves what

It might be held with more show of reason that the promise is made to the just of Corinth, to those who were standing in grace (v. 12). But since no one is infallibly certain whether he is in the state of grace, the promise in this view also could afford no consolation to any individual. Hence it is most probable that the Apostle speaks here to all the faithful of Corinth, and it is the common Catholic teaching that all the *faithful*, even obdurate sinners among them, have sufficient grace and a possible way out of every temptation. Pope Innocent X condemned as heretical the proposition of Jansenius : " Aliqua Dei praecepta hominibus justis volentibus et conantibus, secundum praesentes quas habent vires, sunt impossibilia ; deest quoque illis gratia qua possibilia fiunt " ; and the Council of Trent, Sess. vi, cap. xi, says : " Deus impossibilia non jubet, sed jubendo monet et facere quod possis, et petere quod non possis, et adjuvat ut possis."

14. "Wherefore," i.e., since past Divine favours are no guarantee that we may not fall away and be severely punished (x. 1 ff.) ; and since God is prepared to do His part (x. 13), " wherefore fly from idolatry." St. Thomas says : " Dicit ergo *propter quod*, ac si diceret : quia sacramenta sola non salvant, et qui cadit punitur, et auxilium Dei non deest, fugite," etc. The endearing title, " my beloved," almost softens the command into an entreaty. The " idolatry " from which they are to fly is not, of course, the direct worship of idols—for we may be sure that the Christians of Corinth did not need to be warned against that—but, as the following verses (14-22) show, participation in the sacrificial banquets of the heathens, celebrated at the shrines. In verses 14-22, then, he treats of the eating of the meats at the shrines of the idols, and in the remainder of the chapter he lays down rules for the guidance of the Corinthians in regard to those meats on other occasions. Φάγαν ἀπό is pressed by many commentators as stronger than φάγαν followed by the accusative, but see vi. 18.

15. He pays them the compliment of appealing to their own judgment (there is no sarcasm, cf. i. 5-7), and proceeds at once to argue from what he takes to be admitted by all, namely, the union established between Christians and Christ in the Eucharistic banquet. The change from λέγω to φημί is probably only for

¹⁵ Calix benedictionis, cui benedicimus nonne communicatio sanguinis Christi est? et panis quem frangimus, nonne partici-

I say. ¹⁶ The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? And the bread,

variety. Compare the Vulgate rendering of the two verbs in Rom. iii. 8.

16. That there is reference to the consecrated chalice and the sacrificial banquet of Christians, there can be no doubt; for the context shows that the Apostle is arguing against participation in pagan sacrificial banquets by setting forth what participation in their own sacrificial banquet means for Christians (vv. 16-17), and for Jews (v. 18). The argument supposes, therefore, that Christians have a sacrifice and a sacrificial banquet. "The chalice of the blessing, which we bless," is, therefore, the consecrated chalice which we (Christians, through and in union with our priests) consecrate. Hence even if the blessing mentioned in Matt. xxvi. 26, Mark xiv. 22, and the thanksgiving in Matt. xxvi. 27, Mark xiv. 23, Luke xxii. 17, 1 Cor. xi. 24 be held to have preceded, and not included, the words of consecration,* we still hold that the blessing here mentioned by St. Paul includes the words of consecration, for it is unnatural to suppose that the Apostle, while certainly meaning the consecrated chalice, designates it by referring to the blessing which preceded the consecration.

He asks: is not (partaking of) this chalice communion in the blood of Christ, i.e., does not partaking of this chalice unite us to the blood of Christ? And does not partaking of the consecrated bread unite us to the body of Christ? Τὸν ἄφρον is attracted into the case of the following relative. The Vulgate seems to waver between "communicatio" and "participatio," as the translation of κοινωνία, and hence in the one verse gives both. Possibly "communio" would be better than either, though as κοινωνεῖν means "to give a share to," as well as "to have a share in," we cannot be sure that "communicatio" may not be meant. "The bread which we break" is the consecrated bread, for after Christ "broke the bread" at the first celebration

* "Sed quia participium aor. cum altero aoristo finito haud raro ita connectitur, ut duas actiones eodem tempore fuisse significetur (e.g., Acts i. 24), participia ἐσχαριστήσεως et εὐλογήσεως apte adhiberi potuerunt, etsi præter verba consecratoria ea occasione non essent alia a Christo prolata, multo magis autem, si longioris actionis gratiarum et benedictionis jam inchoatae pars præcipua verba consecratoria erant" (Corn. on 1 Cor. xi. 23).

patio corporis Domini est? which we break, is it not the
 17 Quoniam unus panis, unum partaking of the body of the
 corpus multi sumus, omnes qui Lord? 17 For we, being many,
 de uno pane participamus. are one bread, one body, all that

of the Eucharist (xi. 24; Luke xxii. 19; Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22), it became usual to refer to the Eucharistic rite—including both the sacrifice and the reception of the Blessed Eucharist by the faithful—as “the breaking of the bread” or “of bread” (Acts ii. 42, 46; xx. 7, 11; *Didache*, xiv., etc.). The meaning of the verse is, then, that partaking of the consecrated species unites Christians to the blood and body of Christ. The chalice is mentioned first, perhaps because the pagan rites with which the Apostle is comparing the Christian rite, began with a libation. At any rate, it is not meant that the consecration of the chalice preceded that of the bread, for in xi. 23–25, where the Apostle records what took place at the Last Supper, the consecration of the bread comes first, as in the Gospels.

17. Though the preceding verse supposes the union of Christians with Christ through their sacrificial banquet to be admitted by them all, yet the Apostle now confirms this by pointing to their union among themselves, which he declares to be a result of their common union with Christ.

Whether we construe: “because (there is) one bread, we being many are one body,” or “because we being many, are one bread, one body,” the general sense just given is not altered, but the latter construction seems more probable, both because it is that adopted by the Greek Fathers, and because if the Apostle had meant the former, he would probably have written ὅτι εἷς ὁ ἄρτος or ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος ἵσθι. The last clause runs in the original: “for we all (οἱ γὰρ πάντες) partake of the one bread.” St. Thomas understands “we being many are one bread, one body,” to indicate the twofold unity by which Christians are united, that of incorporation in Christ the true Bread, and that of deriving their common life from Christ, their Head: “Duplicem unitatem exprimere voluit, primam incorporationis quum dicit: unus panis; alteram vitae et sensus, quam a Christo capite accipimus, quum addit: et unum corpus.” We are one in Christ, and we live by His life.

The last clause of the verse proves not only the real presence but also transubstantiation, for if the substance of bread remained, St. Paul in Ephesus could not say to the Christians of Corinth

¹⁸ Videte Israel secundum carnem : nonne qui edunt hostias, participes sunt altaris ? ¹⁹ Quid ergo ? dico quod idolis immolatum sit aliquid ? aut quod partake of one bread. ¹⁸ Behold Israel according to the flesh : are not they that eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar ? ¹⁹ What then ? Do I say that

that he and they partook of the one bread. The bread on the altar in Dublin is not the bread on the altar in Rome, if the substance of the bread remain. It is only because the substance of the bread has passed away, and in each case given place to the one body of Christ, that all can be said to eat of the one bread—of the one substance, which is still called bread, because it had been bread and still retains the species of bread. It is absurd to say that the bread in Dublin and in Rome can be spoken of as one, merely because in each case it is a sign of the one body of Christ. Two things are not one, merely because they *signify* the same thing ; but the Apostle declares that “ we all eat of the one bread.”

18. Having set forth what is involved in participation in the sacrificial banquet of Christians, the Apostle now refers to the sacrificial banquets of the Jews. “ Israel according to the flesh ” means here not all the Jews, but only those unconverted, in opposition to the true Israel, “ the Israel of God ” (Rom. iv. 11 ; Gal. vi. 14). The meaning of what follows seems to be : are not they who eat the sacrifices, brought into communion with—into connection with—the altar (θυσιαστήριον), i.e., with the sacrifice, the altar by metonymy being put for the sacrifice offered on it ? In most of the Jewish sacrifices, only a portion of the victim was burned on the altar ; the remainder went to the priests and offerers. The Apostle supposes it to be generally admitted that those who partook of this remainder were brought into close relation with the sacrifice. He does not say that they were brought into close relation with God, for while this might have been said in some sense, prior to the Sacrifice of Calvary and the abolition of the Jewish religion, it was no longer possible to say it when St. Paul wrote.

19. “ What then do I say ? ” Φημί looks back to the φημί of v. 15. “ That a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything ? ” A few ancient authorities (K. L., Syrr.) invert the order of the clauses, but overwhelming evidence (B X C D E P, and Copt., Arm., Aeth. versions) favours the order of the Vulgate. In warning you against joining in the sacrificial

idolum sit aliquid? ²⁰ Sed quæ immolant gentes, daemoniis immolant et non Deo. Nolo autem vos socios fieri daemoniorum: non potestis calicem Domini bibere, et what is offered in sacrifice to idols is anything? or that the idol is anything? ²⁰ But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made

banquets of the heathens, do I thereby imply, St. Paul says, that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything or that an idol is anything? See above on viii. 4. Meats, indeed, they were in the one case, and blocks of wood, stone, or metal in the other; but *formaliter* as affected in the one case by having been offered to a god, or as representing a god in the other, they were nothing, for there were no such beings as Zeus or Aphrodite.

20. The Apostle, then, does not mean to affirm that there were, "but (I say that, ὅτι) the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God."* Here, then, is the reason why the Corinthian Christians must not participate in heathen sacrificial banquets. "Not that the Gentiles commonly were conscious of worshipping evil spirits, or that there was a devil locally resident in every idol, or even that to every deity of heathendom there was some devil corresponding, but that heathen worship had grown generally so inane, so superstitious, and so impure, as to be ruinous to the souls of the worshippers and thereby a grateful service to the enemies of mankind, who found in the legends, rites, and emblems of such a religion a powerful instrument of corruption and incentive to sin, and who also seem to have been permitted not unfrequently to mingle their personal action with such rites, causing false signs and wonders, as happens in the unchristian regions of the East even to this day" (Rick.). Thus, whatever the intention of the offerers, the heathen sacrifices were really in honour of the devils. Δαιμόνιον is always used in the New Testament of evil spirits, except in Acts xvii. 18, where the speakers, being pagan Athenians, apply it, after the usual Greek manner, to deities. Evil spirits, then, are certainly meant in the present case, not false pagan deities.—"And I do not wish that you should come into com-

* Καὶ εἰς τὸ θεῶν might mean "and to that which is not God" in the sense of a no-God (cf. Deut. xxxii. 21; Rom. x. 19), thus pointing to another object of heathen worship besides the devils, but since the Apostle goes on to speak only of their fellowship with the devils, it is better to take καὶ εἰς τὸ θεῶν as meaning "and not to God."

calicem daemoniorum : ²¹ Non potestis mensae Domini participes esse, et mensae daemoniorum. ²² An aemulamur Dominum ? Numquid fortiores illo sumus ? Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia expediunt.

partakers with devils. ²¹ You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils : you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils. ²² Do we provoke the Lord to jealousy ? Are we stronger than He ? All things are lawful for me, but all things are not expedient.

munion with the devils." This rendering brings out the force of *γινώσκειν*, as well as of *κοινωνός*, which Grimm rightly renders here, "in communionem eorum (i.e., daemonum) adducti."

21. The Apostle declares that they could not, consistently or lawfully, participate in the Christian sacrificial banquet and also in those of the heathens. Even if "the table" referred directly only to the table at which the sacrificial food was partaken of, it would still imply, whether at the Christian or the heathen temple, the altar at which the food was consecrated ; but it probably refers directly to the altar, for the word was already used in that sense in the Old Testament : Mal. i. 7, 12 ; Ezek. xli. 22 ; xliv. 16 ; and frequently afterwards by the Fathers of the Church.* The Council of Trent understands it of the altar, for speaking of the Sacrifice of the Mass (Sess. xxii, cap. 1, *De Sacrif. Missae*) the Fathers of the Council declare : " Et haec quidem illa munda oblatio est . . . quam non obscure innuit Apostolus Paulus, Corinthiis scribens, cum dicit, non posse eos, qui participatione mensae daemoniorum polluti sunt, mensae Domini participes fieri, *per mensam altare utrobique intelligens*."

22. " Or (†) do we provoke the Lord to jealousy ? " i.e., by clinging to the heathen sacrificial banquets. And if we do, " are we stronger than He ? " In other words, have we not reason to dread the consequences ?

The whole passage vv. 14-22 affords the clearest possible proof that the Blessed Eucharist is a sacrifice. Not only is it compared with the real sacrifices of the Jews and of the heathens, but the validity of the Apostle's reasoning requires that it be a true and real sacrifice, for his argument is that as the Christian sacrificial banquet unites Christians with Christ, and the Jewish banquets unite the Jews with the altar, so the heathen sacrifices unite

* See refs. in Corn., p. 301.

¶ Omnia mihi licent, sed non omnia edificant. ²⁴ Nemo quod suum est quaerat, sed quod alterius. ²⁵ Omne quod in macello venit manducate, nihil interrogantes propter con-

²³ All things are lawful for me, but all things do not edify. ²⁴ Let no man seek his own, but that which is another's. ²⁵ Whatsoever is sold in the shambles, eat : asking no

their votaries with the devils. The argument would be pointless, and should necessarily be seen by the Corinthians to be pointless, unless it was generally recognised by Christians that they had a sacrifice in connection with their " chalice " and " bread " (v. 16).

23. Going on now to discuss the eating of idolothytes at a distance from the heathen shrines, and therefore in circumstances where there was no close connection with the sacrifices, he recalls the maxim : " all things are lawful to me " (vi. 12), thereby implying that such eating was not wrong in itself. The maxim regards, of course, only things indifferent in themselves, but even so the Apostle insists here, as he did in Chapter vi, that it must be qualified, because not all indifferent things are expedient to oneself or edifying to others. " Saying they are not expedient, he alludes to injury to oneself, and saying they don't edify, he hints at scandal to the brother " (St. Chrysostom.).

24. The prohibition is probably not absolute, for seeking one's own good is not always wrong. The idea is : let him seek rather the good of his neighbour, and then he will promote also his own spiritual good. *Τοῦ ἑτέρου* means " of our neighbours " or " of others," as in Rom. xiii. 8 : " He that loveth his neighbour (τὸν ἑτέρον) hath fulfilled the law." Estius, however, takes the prohibition as absolute, and holds that in Scriptural language *seeking* one's good means studying one's own advantage to the disregard and neglect of the common good. He relies chiefly on xiii. 5 : " Charity seeketh not her own," as implying that seeking one's own is inconsistent with charity. But the explanation given above is more natural and more common.

25. " In the shambles," i.e., in the meat-market. The Greek word, which is from the Latin " macellum," is found only here in New Testament, and not at all in LXX. Probably a good deal of the meat sold in the market came from the heathen sacrifices.* " For conscience sake." The sense seems to be : make no inquiries, for the sake of easing your conscience, as to whether the meat was offered in sacrifice.

* See Deissmann, *Light from the Ancient East*, p. 274.

scientiam. ²⁶ Domini est terra et plenitudo eius. ²⁷ Si quis vocat vos infidelium, et vultis ire : omne quod vobis apponitur manducate, nihil interrogantes propter conscientiam. ²⁸ Si quis autem dixerit : Hoc im-

question for conscience sake. ²⁶ *The earth is the Lord's, and the fulness thereof.* ²⁷ If any of them that believe not, invite you, and you be willing to go : eat of anything that is set before you, asking no question for conscience sake. ²⁸ But if any

26. Here he gives the reason why they are not to scruple about eating such meat ; it is, "because" (τοῦ γὰρ Κυρίου), as the Psalmist declared : "to the Lord belongs the earth and all its abundance," and hence no creature of itself can defile us, though it may do so through our false conscience or our disobedience. "Every creature of God is good, and nothing to be rejected that is received with thanksgiving" (1 Tim. iv. 4) ; cf. also Mark vii. 19, where in the true reading the concluding words mean : "making (or declaring) all foods clean," and Acts x. 15.

27. Omit δέ after εἰ. Besides the case of eating at the idol's shrine, and that of eating what was sold in the market, there was the third case of eating at the house of a pagan, where very possibly meats that had been offered to an idol might be served. The Apostle implies by his language that he does not expect the Corinthians to look for hospitality from a heathen, unless invited ; and even then, he insinuates, it would be better not to go. But if they do go, as in the preceding case (v. 25) they need ask no question for conscience sake.

28. Ἐάν δέ τις. "The change from εἰ to εἰάν is perhaps intentional, although the difference between the two is less in late Greek than in earlier. "If any one invites you," a thing which is very possible and may have happened. "If any one should say to you," = pure hypothesis, and not so very probable. In Gal. i. 8, 9, we have a change from εἰάν to εἰ" (Rob.-Plumm.). It is not quite clear whether the Apostle wrote τοῦτο ἐπεθύρὸν ἔστιν or τοῦτο εἰσκαλούμενον ἔστιν. For the former we have the three oldest Greek MSS. B M A and H, together with the Sahid. version ; while the latter is read by C D E F G K L P, nearly all cursives, and by the Vulg., Syr., and Copt. versions. ἐπεθύρὸν occurs nowhere else in New Testament or LXX, and this, as well as the evidence of the oldest MSS., is strongly in its favour here, as there would have been no likelihood of its being substituted for

molatum est idolis : nolite manducare, propter illum qui indicavit, et propter conscientiam : ²⁸ Conscientiam autem dico non tuam, sed alterius.

man say : This has been sacrificed to idols ; do not eat of it for his sake that told it, and for conscience sake. ²⁸ Conscience I say, not thy own, but the

εἰδωλόθυτον, had the Apostle written the latter, while it might readily be replaced by the more usual word. If we read it, the meaning is : " but if any one say unto you, this was offered in sacrifice," while in the alternative reading the meaning is, " but if any one say unto you, this was offered to an idol." The latter expression would not be likely to be used by a pagan, for the heathens did not call their gods idols, and hence if this reading had to be adopted, we should hold that the speaker who is supposed to intervene was a Jew or a Christian. We may take it, however, that ἐσθῆτον is more probably the correct reading ; and he who is supposed to intervene may be pagan, Jew, or Christian, for the Apostle's language is general : " but if *anyone* say to you."

If then anyone should say that the meat had been offered in sacrifice, they are to abstain from it, whether there be question of meats sold in the market-place or served by a friend, the exception of v. 28 affecting the general rule of v. 25 as well as of v. 27. And they are to abstain, no matter who had called their attention to the fact that the meat had been sacrificed ; for if it was a pagan who had done so, knowing that idolatry was condemned by the Christian religion, if he saw them eat he would probably rush to the conclusion that they were despising their own law and acting idolatrously, and he would in consequence be led to despise them and their religion ; if it was a Jew, since everyone of the Jewish faith abominated all idols and meats offered to them, he would certainly be shocked to see them eat, and in this way prejudiced against the Christian faith ; while, finally, if it was a scrupulous Christian, he might be led by their eating to act against his own conscience, as the Apostle has already set forth (viii. 10-13).

29. The Apostle has just said that they should abstain for sake of the person who had pointed out that the meat had been sacrificed, and for conscience sake, and he now explains what conscience he refers to : " conscience, I say, not thy own (ταυτοῦ is for σεαυτοῦ, if it be not indefinite in the sense of ' one's own ') but of others." Τοῦ ἑτέρου, as in v. 24, means " of others " as

Ut quid enim libertas mea iudicatur ab aliena conscientia ?

³⁰ Si ego cum gratia participo, quid blasphemor pro eo quod gratias ago ? ³¹ Sive ergo man-

other's. For why is my liberty judged by another man's conscience ? ³⁰ If I partake with thanksgiving, why am I evil-spoken of for that for which I give thanks ? ³¹ Therefore,

opposed to ourselves. To take it, as many have done, of the person who called attention to the fact that the meat was sacrificed, is to make the Apostle merely repeat himself, since he has already stated in v. 28 that they ought to abstain for sake of that person. Hence what the Apostle declares is that they ought to abstain for sake of that person and for the sake of others, meaning chiefly the others who might be present at the meal.

"For why is my liberty judged by another man's conscience ?" The sense seems to be : *for to what purpose (ὁτι) is my liberty, exercised in eating in such circumstances, condemned by another's conscience ? Can any good come of it, and not rather great harm ? Various other explanations have been offered of this clause ; in particular it has been held by many that it and the following verse are put into the mouth of a Christian who protests against having his liberty restricted by the false consciences of others, and that St. Paul in v. 31 replies to the protest. "Sed refellunt hunc commentarium," says Estius neatly, "conjunctiones enim et ergo, quarum illa probantis est, non obicientis ; ista concludentis, non ad objecta respondentis."*

30. Still urging, as in the last clause of v. 29, the incongruity and unlawfulness of exercising one's liberty to the scandal of others, the Apostle says : "If I with thanksgiving partake, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks ?" As if he said : if I thank God at my meals, if I say *grace* at them and thus imply that my partaking of them is pleasing to God, is it not incongruous that I should force others to speak or think ill of me by the scandal I give ? This seems to be the true view of the verse ; "*grace*" (χάρις) is to be understood of thanksgiving, not of God's beneficence, for εὐχαριστῶ looks back to χάρις of the preceding clause.

31. He concludes his treatment of the subject of meats and drinks offered to idols by telling the Corinthians, and through them us, to do whatsoever we do for the glory of God. This they would certainly not do who would act to the scandal of their

ducatis, sive bibitis, sive aliud quid facitis : omnia in gloriam Dei facite. ³² Sine offensione whether you eat or drink, or whatsoever else you do, do all to the glory of God. ³² Be

neighbour. The actions of eating and drinking are selected for special mention, because the question has been of eating and drinking things that had been offered to idols. Some, like St. Bonaventure, take this verse as conveying only a counsel, not a precept ; but this is less probable, for, as Estius points out, the Apostle wishes it to be inferred from the fact that everything is to be done for the glory of God, that they are guilty of sin who without taking account of God's honour and their neighbour's conscience partake of meats or drinks that had been offered to idols ; and this inference would not be justified if this verse contained only a counsel. There is a precept, then ; not, however, a precept that has anything whatever to do with the famous question disputed between Thomists and Scotists as to whether a given individual act can be indifferent in the *natural* order, but, as Estius says, a precept directed only to the faithful and to those to whom the faith of Christ has been announced, who therefore have or ought to have knowledge of the supernatural end to which the Christian religion directs, binding them *at most* to refer virtually all their actions to God as their *supernatural* end.* I say *at most*, because some great commentators, as Est., Lap., Corn., are inclined to regard the present precept, though positive in form, as really negative and explained by the following verse, in the sense that we must not do anything, such as eating, to the scandal of our neighbour, whereby the glory of God would be hindered.

32. " Be without offence "—rather " Become inoffensive (*i.e.*, giving no occasion of sin) as well to the Jews as to the Greeks and to the Church of God." " Become " (*γίνεσθε*) suggests very plainly that some of them were hitherto wanting in this respect. By the Jews and Greeks are meant the unconverted Jews and Gentiles (Greeks meaning here Gentiles, as in Rom. i. 16, ii. 10), and by the Church of God the faithful individually, as well as the whole Christian society and especially that portion of it which was resident at Corinth.

* " Et si quaeratur," says St. Thomas, "*quando oporteat actum referre in finem ultimum, hoc nihil aliud est quam quaerere quando oporteat habitum charitatis exire in actum ; quia quandocumque habitus charitatis in actum exit, fit ordinatio totius hominis in finem ultimum, et per consequens omnium eorum quæ in ipsum ordinantur ut bona sibi*" (2 Dist. 40, quaest. i., art. 5, ad 6).

estote Iudæis, et gentibus, et ecclesiae Dei; ³³ Sicut et ego per omnia omnibus placeo, non quaerens quod mihi utile est, sed quod multis, ut salvi fiant.

without offence to the Jews and to the Gentiles, and to the church of God: ³³ As I also in all things please all men, not seeking that which is profitable to myself, but to many; that they may be saved.

33. "In all things," i.e., in all things *indifferent*, a restriction which the whole context implies. He does not mean of course that he would do *wrong* in order to please others. 'Απὸ παντός ("I please") means here rather "I endeavour to please," for notwithstanding all his efforts to accommodate himself in all things to the wishes and prejudices of others, the Apostle was not always successful in pleasing.—"Not seeking," etc., describes the manner in which he endeavoured to please; and "that they may be saved," the end he had in view—not popularity, but the salvation of as many as possible.

The first verse of the next chapter should have been placed at the end of this; the present division of the chapters is quite misleading.—"Become imitators of me, even as I also am of Christ." Imitation in self-sacrifice for the good of others, is evidently what is chiefly meant, and in imitating Paul they shall imitate Christ, "for Christ did not please Himself" (Rom. xi. 3; cf. 2 Cor. viii. 9; Eph. v. 2; Phil. ii. 4-8). With this suggested thought of how Christ sacrificed Himself for the good of others, the Apostle concludes this section of the Epistle (cc. viii.-x) about meats offered to idols.

Before passing to the next section, we must say something regarding the relation of the Apostle's teaching to the decree of the Council of Jerusalem in reference to meats offered to idols (Acts xv. 28-29), for the Council, without any reference to the danger of scandal, seems to forbid all such meats. Some Rationalists have used Paul's silence here about the decree as an argument against the historicity of Acts, while others of them have held that he deliberately declines to take any account of the decree, and solves the whole question independently on his own lines.

Among Catholics, some have suggested that the decree had not yet become known at Corinth, others that it had already fallen into desuetude. It is hard to see how either view can be maintained, for the Council was held about six or seven years

before this Epistle was written, so that there was ample time for the decree to become known in Corinth even if St. Paul had not referred to it during the eighteen months which he spent there shortly after the Council was held (Acts xviii. 11). On the other hand, we can hardly admit that the legislation of the Council would be entirely set at nought in so short a time by any Christian community. Others have held that the decree of the Council was never meant to extend to places like Corinth, but only to those places mentioned in the decree itself, viz., Antioch, Syria and Cilicia (Acts xv. 23). Others, again, hold that the decree did extend to all places where, as in those just mentioned, there were many Jews as well as Gentiles living together. In all such places there would be nearly always danger of scandal, and to remove the danger, the Council may have absolutely forbidden in those places the use of such meats. But St. Paul, who was present at the Council (Acts xv. 12), would know that the absolute prohibition was not meant to extend to such places as Corinth, where the church contained but few Jews (Acts xviii. 5 ff.). Hence he was free to explain the matter independently to the Corinthians, taking account, on the one hand, of the fact that an idol could not defile food, and, on the other, of the danger of scandal, which would sometimes arise even in Corinth. He had no need, then, to refer here to the decree of the Council of Jerusalem, and the difference between his teaching and that of the Council arises from the fact that the Church of Corinth was chiefly composed of Gentiles, while the churches for which the Council legislated were largely mixed, made up of Jews and Gentiles.

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

On account of their inferiority to men, women ought to veil their heads in the Christian liturgical assemblies (v. 2-6). This inferiority of women is shown by the history of creation (7-12). The use of the veil by women is suggested by nature itself, and approved by the Apostles and all the other churches (13-16). Abuses in connection with the love-feasts of the Corinthian Christians (17-22); abuses all the more unworthy in that they were so closely connected with the Blessed Eucharist, which was celebrated on the same occasions (23-26). Threats against such as receive the Blessed Eucharist unworthily, and exhortation to prepare to receive it (27-32). Concluding instructions in regard to the love-feasts (33-34).

¹ IMITATORES mei estote, sicut et ego Christi. ² Laudo autem vos fratres, quod per omnia mei memores estis, et sicut tradidi vobis, praecepta mea tenetis. ³ Volo autem vos scire, quod omnis viri caput Christus est :

¹ Be ye followers of me, as I also am of Christ. ² Now I praise you, brethren, that in all things you are mindful of me : and keep my ordinances as I have delivered them to you. ³ But I would have you know,

A new sub-section of the Epistle (xi. 2-xiv. 40) begins here with verse 2. From their domestic (vii. 1 ff.) and social life (viii. 1 ff.), the Apostle passes to their religious life, in connection with which he deals (a) with the headdress of women in their religious assemblies (xi. 2-16), (b) with abuses connected with their love-feasts (xi. 17-34), (c) with the whole question of charisms, or, as they are called, *gratiae gratis datae* (xii. 1-xiv. 40).

2. "That in all things you are mindful of me." So, apparently, they had assured him in their letter already referred to (vii. 1). There is no need to regard his words of praise as ironical, any more than in i. 4-7. Read "the ordinances" instead of "my ordinances."

3. "But I would have you know." The words seem to show that he had not before instructed them on this matter, that it is not one of the matters on which they had "ordinances" from him. What he now wants them to know is, that over every male

caput autem mulieris, vir : that the head of every man is
 caput vero Christi, Deus. ⁴ Om- Christ : and the head of the
 nis vir orans aut prophetans woman is the man : and the
 velato capite, deturpat caput head of Christ is God. ⁴ Every
 suum. ⁵ Omnis autem mulier man praying or prophesying
 orans aut prophetans non with his head covered, dis-
 velato capite, deturpat caput graceth his head. ⁵ But every
 suum : unum enim est ac si woman praying or prophesying
 with her head not covered, dis-
 graceth her head : for it is all

member of the human family Christ has authority, over women men have authority, and over Christ God has authority. The reference is to Christ as man, to whom all things are subjected (xv. 26-28). "Every man" need not be restricted to Christian men, as Cornely, following the Greeks, restricts it, for Christ having honoured human nature in his assumption of it, has authority over every man who shares it, whether Christian or non-Christian, and though the Apostle has no doubt Christian men and women in view in what follows, yet he could well set forth Christ's universal headship, and then go on to apply it in the case of the Christian man. That he does so, seems to us most probable from his words : "every[†] man," not "every brother." Of course, Christ as man is Head of every woman too, but the idea here is that He is the immediate superior of mankind, as mankind is of womankind, that the divinely established order is : God, Christ, man, woman. "Woman," γυνή has often with St. Paul the sense of wife, e.g., vii. 3-4, and in Eph. v. 23 he speaks of the husband as the head of his wife, but in our text, as the verses following will clearly show, the word means woman, and includes virgins and widows as well as wives.

4-5. The question is of *public* prayer and prophecy in the Christian liturgical assemblies, not of private prayer at home, and probably not merely of a cap or hat on the head, but of a veil hanging down from the head, "de capite pendens velum" (Grimm, *Lex.*, Graec.—Lat. *sub voce* κατά). The Christian women of Corinth were evidently in the habit of attending the liturgical assemblies without veils. Probably the Apostle refers to all the men and women who attended such meetings, and not merely to those who might receive a special charism enabling them to make some prayer or prophecy aloud, for later on, xiv. 34, he forbids women to speak in the Christian assemblies at all. He

decalvetur. * Nam si non velatur mulier tondeatur. Si vero turpe est mulieri tonderi, aut decalvari, velet caput suum.

one as if she were shaven. * For if a woman be not covered, let her be shorn. But if it be a shame to a woman to be shorn or made bald, let her cover her head.

does not mean that the man who may get the gift of prayer or prophecy ought to be without the veil, and that those not getting it might wear it if they wished, but that all the men present, inasmuch as they were engaged in, and joined in, the sacred work of prayer or prophecy, ought not to wear it, and all the women ought to wear it.—“Disgraceth his head.” Some take the sense to be, “disgraceth Christ,” who has been declared in the preceding verse to be his Head. It seems better, however, to take “head” literally, as it is taken already in these verses in the words “with his head veiled,” “with her head not veiled,” and to understand that because the veil was a *sign of subjection*, the man who wore it disgraced his head by implying that he had some superior on earth, just as the woman who did not wear it disgraced her head, by implying that she had no earthly superior. This reasoning might seem to forbid the veil or covering in question to men and prescribe it for women, in all circumstances even outside liturgical assemblies, as Estius and others hold it does; but the words “praying or prophesying” of *vv.* 4, 5, and *v.* 13: “Judge ye among yourselves, doth it become a woman to pray unto God, unveiled?” show that the Apostle is thinking of liturgical assemblies; and if, as St. Chrysostom says: “a prince appearing before his king ought to bear the sign of his princely state,” then men appearing before their God in worship ought to proclaim by unveiled head their God-given superiority, and women by the veil their subjection to man. Thus the Apostle is speaking of dress *at court*, as it were, and need not be understood to refer to dress on other occasions.—“For it is all one as if she were shaven”; rather, “for she is one and the same thing with the woman that is shaven” (See Blass, *Gr.* § 31, 2).

6. The meaning of the first clause is: for if a woman is not veiled, let her *also* (καί) cut her hair close, and so be thoroughly masculine. As St. Chrysostom says: If she flings away the covering provided by divine ordinance, let her also fling away the covering provided by nature. Κατέστω is middle voice, not passive, and so, too, the other verbs that follow.—“But if it

⁷ Vir quidem non debet velare
caput suum : quoniam imago
et gloria Dei est, mulier autem

⁷ The man indeed ought not
to cover his head, because he is
the image and glory of God ;
but the woman is the glory of

is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled." Over the world it was a disgrace to a woman to have her hair cut close or shaven. It happened only to female slaves among the Greeks ; among the Romans only to dancers, most of whom were harlots ; and Tacitus says that the Germans cut close the hair of adulteresses (*Germ.* xix.).

7. The Apostle has argued from the Divinely constituted order : God, Christ, man, woman (v. 3), that women ought not to abuse their Christian liberty (Gal. iii. 28) by appearing unveiled, like men, in the liturgical assemblies. He now proceeds to enforce his teaching by alluding to the history of the creation of the first man and woman. " *For* (a) man indeed (ἀνὴρ μὲν γάρ) is not under any obligation to have his head covered, for he is the image and glory of God, but woman (even if, with many authorities ἢ be read before γυνή, the reference is to the *sex*) is the glory of man." The allusion is to Genesis i. 27, ii. 7, where God is shown to have created the first man in His own immediate image and likeness, but the woman in the likeness of the man (Gen. ii. 18 : "let us make him a help *like unto himself*"). Not that woman too was not created in the image and likeness of God, for Gen. i. 27 : "And God created man to His own image : to the image of God He created him : male and female He created them," shows that woman too was created in God's image and likeness, but the Apostle seems to argue that while man was created *immediately* in the likeness of God, woman was created *immediately* in the likeness of man, and only *mediately*, and through her likeness to man, in the likeness of God (cf. 1 Tim. ii. 13). Man and woman are made in the image of God in their spiritual part, wherein they are endowed with a trinity of powers : memory, understanding, and free will. Man is the glory (δόξα) of God, because he is the king of earthly creatures, in whom God is most honoured, while woman is the glory of man, showing forth his excellence, as he does God's.*

* " Personae, quarum virtus aliis laudi et gloriae vertenda est, appellantur horum δόξα ut 1 The. ii. 20 ; 2 Cor. viii. 23 " (Grimm).

gloria viri est. ⁸ Non enim vir ex muliere est, sed mulier ex viro. ⁹ Etenim non est creatus vir propter mulierem, sed mulier propter virum. ¹⁰ Ideo debet mulier potestatem habere supra caput, propter Angelos.

the man. ⁸ For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man. ⁹ For the man was not created for the woman, but the woman for the man. ¹⁰ Therefore ought the woman to have a power over her head,

8. Proves that woman is man's glory, because she was made from him. The allusion is to Gen. ii. 21, 22, with which the Corinthian Christians are supposed to be acquainted.

9. "For also man was not (καὶ γὰρ οὐκ; R.V. : 'For neither was man') created," etc. Another reason why she is the glory of man; she was not only made from him, but also for him (Gen. ii. 18). Even if ἡ be read before γυνή, with B H D F G P, the direct reference in the verse seems to be more probably to the sexes, and not to the first man and woman.

10. This is a most peculiar verse. Our version renders: "Therefore ought the woman to have a power over her head, because of the angels"; and the Revised Version: "For this cause ought the woman to have a sign of authority on her head, because of the angels." Ἐξουσία means power, authority, control, and the Revised Version suggests what is the common view of the first part of the text, namely, that woman, because she is the glory of man, and subject to man, ought to have on her head at public prayer a veil, as a sign of man's authority over her. No better explanation than this has been found. Emendations of the text, by reading something else instead of Ἐξουσία, have been often suggested, but they are all improbable. Ramsay (*The Cities of St. Paul*, pp. 202 ff.) holds that it is the woman's own authority and dignity that is meant, and that the veil is to be worn as a sign and safeguard of that dignity: "a woman's authority vanishes (in Oriental lands) along with the all-covering veil that she discards." But the veil as a sign or protection of a woman's dignity is wholly out of place in the present context, where the Apostle clearly argues for the use of the veil by woman on account of her inferiority to man. The common view, then, is most probably correct; and if we might have expected the Apostle rather to say that she ought to have a sign of her own subjection (ὁμολογίῃ, 1 Tim. ii. 11; iii. 4, or ὁμολογίῃ, Rom. vi. 16; xvi. 19) than of man's authority, over her head, yet the sense is the same, while the word the Apostle has chosen throws man's

¹¹ Verumtamen neque vir sine muliere, neque mulier sine viro, in Domino. ¹² Nam sicut mulier de viro, ita et vir per mulierem : omnia autem ex Deo.

¹³ Vos ipsi iudicate : decet mulierem non velatam orare

because of the Angels. ¹¹ But yet neither is the man without the woman, nor the woman without the man, in the Lord. ¹² For as the woman is of the man, so also is the man by the woman ; but all things of God.

¹³ You yourselves judge : doth it become a woman to

authority directly into prominence, and the context guards us against misunderstanding it of any authority but his.

"Because of the angels." Many Latin authorities read "et" or "etiam," before this clause, as though a new reason were given. But the evidence of the best MSS. of the Vulgate, as well of the other versions, and of the Greek MSS. quite rules out any connecting particle. Hence the words cannot contain an entirely new argument ; "they can be only the complement of the argument already given. The modesty and submission proper to a woman has been argued to require her head to be covered, especially in the Lord's house. The angels, the ministering angels (Heb. i. 14 ; cf. Eph. iii. 10 ; and above, iv. 9) gathered there, expect such modest covering : be it worn accordingly *because of the angels*" (Rick.). There appears no great probability in the view that by "angels" are meant bishops (cf. Apoc. ii. 1, 8, 12, etc.) or priests or both ; less, that all the men present in the Christian assembly are meant ; less still that the reference is to demons, who might lust after the unveiled women or incite men to do so. Nor can we regard as probable the view that *διὰ τ. ἀγγ.* may mean "because the angels do so," i.e., veil their faces in the presence of their Superior. The verse is indeed strange, but if the text is correct—and we have no reason to doubt it—the common view is the best, namely, that women at public prayer ought to wear a veil as a sign of man's authority over them, because the angels present in the Christian assemblies expect them to do so.

11. The Vulgate order of the clauses must be inverted. Though woman is subject to man, yet man cannot treat her with contempt, but the mutual dependence must be recognised, "in the Lord," i.e., among Christians.

13-15. He appeals to their own sense of propriety against the unseemliness of a woman's appearing unveiled at public prayer.

Deum ? ¹⁴ Nec ipsa natura docet vos quod vir quidem si comam nutriat, ignominia est illi : ¹⁵ Mulier vero si comam nutriat, gloria est illi : quoniam capilli pro velamine ei dati sunt. ¹⁶ Si quis autem videtur contentiosus esse : nos talem

pray unto God, uncovered ? ¹⁴ Doth not even nature itself teach you, that a man indeed, if he nourish his hair, it is a shame unto him : ¹⁵ But if a woman nourish her hair, it is a glory to her, for her hair is given to her for a covering. ¹⁶ But if any man seem to be

Nature itself, he says, teaches us to make a broad distinction between man and woman in regard to head-covering, for if a man have long hair (κορυφή) it is a dishonour to him, while long hair is an honour to a woman, inasmuch as it was given to her for a covering. The unexpressed inference is that the lead given by nature ought to be followed, and women ought to supplement the provision of nature by an artificial covering. At this time men, whether Greeks, Romans, or Jews, commonly wore their hair short ; Greek boys had their long hair cut at the age of eighteen, and to wear long hair after that age was considered foppish. It is possible that the Apostle advances this argument as suasive rather than convincing ; there does not appear to be any solid reason why an inspired writer might not use an argument that would be merely suasive.

16. We take it that this verse is to be connected with the preceding passage, and that the " custom " is that of women appearing unveiled at public prayer. There was no need for the Apostle to say that the Churches of God had not the custom of being contentious, and if it were to contention he referred, he would be much more likely to call it a vice than a custom. If then anyone *chooses* to be contentious, his final argument against the practice of women coming unveiled to public prayer in Corinth, is that the Apostles and the local Christian congregations (read " ecclesiae " instead of Vulg. " ecclesia ") throughout the world recognise no such custom. Some take ἡμεῖς as referring to Jewish Christians, and " the Churches of God " to Gentile congregations, but it is most unlikely that the Apostle would use an expression which might seem to exclude Jewish Christians from the Churches of God. More probable is the view that ἡμεῖς refers only to himself, but even this is not so probable as the view we have adopted, that the reference is to himself and the other Apostles ; for the latter adds weight to the argument, and,

consuetudinem non habemus, contentious, we have no such
neque ecclesia Dei. custom, nor the church of God.

moreover, when, a few verses farther on, he wishes to refer to himself, he does so in the singular number (v. 23).

He now passes on to treat of another and far more serious abuse connected with their liturgical meetings, an abuse which meant grave irreverence towards the Blessed Eucharist. In order to understand what follows in this chapter, we must bear in mind that the early Christians, when they met in the evening to celebrate the Blessed Eucharist, endeavoured to reproduce as far as possible the Last Supper, and so accompanied the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist with a feast. This feast came to be known as the *Agape*, or love-feast because it was an evidence and a cause of mutual charity. At first it seems to have preceded the reception of the Blessed Eucharist, just as the Paschal and ordinary suppers preceded the Eucharistic Supper on the night before Christ's death, and such appears to have been the practice in Corinth when St. Paul wrote. Indeed, when the Blessed Eucharist began to be received *fasting*, we cannot say with certainty. St. Augustine (Ep. cxviii., *Ad Januar.*) regards the custom as introduced by the Apostles; but many doubt this. Sozomen, the historian, makes it clear that in Egypt, in the fifth century, there was not supposed to be any obligation to receive fasting; and in Africa at the end of the fourth century the Third Council of Carthage (A.D. 397) in its 29th canon enjoined that those receiving should do so fasting, except on Holy Thursday: "Ut sacramenta altaris non nisi a jejuniis hominibus celebretur, excepto uno die anniversario, quo coena Domini celebratur." Had the custom of receiving fasting been introduced by the Apostles, it is hard to account for the Egyptian custom or see why the African canon was needed.

At any rate, it is clear from the present chapter that in Corinth at this time the Blessed Eucharist was preceded by a feast, and the discipline of receiving fasting had not yet been introduced there. Each one who could afford it was expected to bring some contribution in kind towards the feast, and in what was thus contributed all were supposed to share alike. It was an echo of the very first days of Christianity, when, as we learn from Acts ii. 44, the brethren had all things in common. Now, serious abuses had arisen in Corinth in connection with these feasts; people of means partook of their own contribution before the

¹⁷ Hoc autem praeceptio : non laudans quod non in melius, sed in deterius convenitis. ¹⁸ Primum quidem convenientibus vobis in ecclesiam, audio scissuras esse inter vos, et ex parte

¹⁷ Now this I ordain : not praising you, that you come together not for the better, but for the worse. ¹⁸ For first of all I hear that when you come together in the church, there are schisms among you, and in

poor could get a share of it (vv. 21, 33) ; moreover, some of them drank to excess (v. 21), and the result was divisions among the brethren and irreverence towards the Blessed Eucharist, which, as we have said, was celebrated on the same occasion.

17. It is doubtful whether we ought to read : " Now, this I command, not praising," or : " Now commanding this, I do not praise, etc." The external evidence for the two readings is about equal, but the latter appears the more natural, for the command refers, we have no doubt, not to the charge given in vv. 28-34, which is too far removed from our present verse to be meant, but to what he has laid down as to the veil to be worn by women ; and after all he has said, there was no need for him to state here that he commanded it (cf. vv. 6, 10). But he could very naturally say : Now giving this command, I have no praise for the fact that your religious meetings do you harm instead of good. The first " you " in our Rheims version is not represented in the Greek or Latin ; what follows the verb " praise " is its object. While their assembling together, particularly for religious purposes, ought to be a source of improvement to them, it actually resulted in harm. " All gregarious animals by natural instinct come together for their better bodily good . . . and therefore the faithful ought to come together for the bettering of their spiritual condition " (St. Thomas on this verse). In regard to this matter, then, he has no praise for them. This looks back to verse 2, where he did praise them.

18. " First of all." For the second point, see xii. 1 ff. Instead of " in the church " we ought to read " in congregation " or " in assembly " (for " ecclesiam " read " ecclesia " in Vulg.). It is most unlikely that there were any buildings specially set apart for Christian worship in Corinth so early as this time, and even if there had been, they would hardly have already got the name of " ecclesia." The phrase evidently means here " in assembly," as it is plainly equivalent to " together " (ἐν τῷ αὐτό) of v. 20 (cf. Acts xix. 32, 39, 40). On ἀσκήσια, see above on i. 2.—By

credo. ¹⁸ Nam oportet et part I believe it. ¹⁹ For there haereses esse, ut et qui probati must be also heresies : that they sunt, manifesti fiant in vobis. also, who are reprov'd, may be ²⁰ Convenientibus ergo vobis in made manifest among you. unum, iam non est Dominicam ²⁰ When you come therefore

"schisms" are meant divisions, separations, such as are suggested by vv. 21, 33; but not schisms in the theological sense, which would separate from union with the Church. Μέρος τι ("in part") is the accusative of extent. Ὑπάρχειν is stronger than εἶναι of the next verse, and seems to imply that the divisions were frequent.

19. "Heresies" is probably not to be understood here in the theological sense, i.e., of an error pertinaciously maintained against some truth of faith proposed by the Church by one who had already embraced the faith. The Apostle does not merely say that "there must be also heresies," but "there must be also heresies among you" (ἐν ὑμῖν must be read); and though, considering man's proneness to error, there must be heresies in the Church, it is not a fact that they must arise in each church, nor did any arise, as far as we know, in the early church of Corinth. Parties or permanent factions, then, are meant, something more serious than the "divisions" already mentioned ("also heresies"), but not amounting to a denial of the faith. "The word αἵρεσις, here translated *heresy*, occurs in eight other places of the New Testament (Acts v. 17; xv. 5; xxvi. 5; xxiv. 5, 14; xxviii. 22; Gal. v. 20; 2 Pet. ii. 1). In six at least of these places it means no more than *sect*. The best realisation of the modern theological meaning is Titus iii. 10: *A man that is a heretic (αἱρετικόν) avoid*" (Rick.).—"That they (also) who are approved, etc." "Also" is to be omitted, the evidence is against it. God brings good out of man's evil, and the factions serve to manifest the true and genuine Christians, because such will keep aloof from faction or try to heal it. The term δοκιμος was applied to metals and stones that had been tested and proved genuine.

20. "When therefore you come together into one place." For ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό cf. Acts i. 15; ii. 1, 44; iii. 1. Their external union is implicitly contrasted with their dissensions. "It is not to eat the *Lord's* supper"; οὐκ ἔστιν might mean: it is not lawful or possible; but more probably there is a statement of fact: what you do is not to eat the Lord's supper; ■ supper they might have, but it was not the Lord's.

"The Lord's supper," without doubt, here includes both the

coenam manducare. ²¹ Unusquisque enim suam coenam praesumit ad manducandum. Et alius quidem esurit, alius autem ebrius est. ²² Numquid domos non habetis ad mandu-

gether into one place, it is not now to eat the Lord's supper. ²¹ For everyone taketh before his own supper to eat. And one indeed is hungry, and another is drunk. ²² What,

Agape and the Eucharistic celebration, for vv. 21, 33 show that it includes the *Agape*, and v. 23 ff. that it includes the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist.* The whole was called the Lord's supper, because it copied His Last Supper, was instituted by Him, and the principal part of it was the reception of the Lord in the Blessed Eucharist. *Δειπνον* in later Greek always, as here, means an evening meal. At first, for some time, the Blessed Eucharist was celebrated in the evening, but before long, probably owing to abuses, the *Agape* was separated from the Blessed Eucharist, and the latter was celebrated in the morning. This was already the case in Bithynia in the early years of the second century, when Pliny wrote *Ep.* 96 to Trajan (A.D. 111-113). St. Justin Martyr (*Apol.* i. 67) describes the Eucharist in the middle of the second century without referring to the *Agape*; and at the close of the same century Tertullian describes the *Agape* without any reference to the Eucharist (*Apol.* 39), and speaks of the Eucharist as then celebrated before daylight (*De Corona*, c. 3). But the present chapter appears to us to prove that at the time it was written a feast such as the *Agape* accompanied the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist at Corinth.

21. "For in eating each one taketh before (the rest) his own supper," i.e., what he had brought with him, thus robbing the supper of the character of a meal in common, and destroying its significance as a symbol and pledge of charity.—"And one is hungry, and another is drunk." This was an additional scandal, that while some wanted necessary food, others indulged to excess in superfluous drink. *Μεθυσ* need not perhaps be pressed to mean that those referred to were quite drunk (cf. John ii. 10), but we cannot say how far they may have exceeded.

22. The Apostle exclaims indignantly: Have you not houses

* We cannot accept the view of P. Batiffol (*Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive*, p. 283 ff.) that there is no reference to the *Agape* in the New Testament, or that St. Paul in the present chapter forbids feasting of every kind in connection with the Eucharistic celebration. For fuller information on this subject see, besides the essay of P. Batiffol referred to, Keating, *The Agape and the Eucharist in the Early Church*; the article on *Agape* in "The Catholic Encyclopedia," and that on *Love-feasts* in Hastings's "Dictionary of the Bible."

candum, et bibendum ? aut ecclesiam Dei contemnitis, et confunditis eos qui non habent ? Quid dicam vobis ? Laudo vos ? in hoc non laudo.

■ Ego enim accepi a Domino quod et tradidi vobis, quoniam Dominus IESUS in qua nocte

have you not houses to eat and to drink in ? Or despise ye the church of God, and put them to shame that have not ? What shall I say to you ? Do I praise you ? In this I praise you not.

²³ For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus,

to eat and to drink in ? or (since you have) is it that you despise the assembly of God, met in God's honour, and deliberately put to shame those who have nothing to eat ? Εἰμὲ and ἐκρινέτω are deliberative subjunctives.

23. In this matter he cannot praise them, for their conduct is sadly out of keeping with the sacred solemnity of the occasion. This he now goes on to show by reminding them of what he had taught them concerning the Blessed Eucharist at the time when he founded their church (Acts xviii. 11). There is no room for doubt that he claims to have received the doctrine in question *immediately* from the Lord, not that the preposition ἀπό defines the *mode* of reception,* but because there is question of what the Lord *did* at the Last Supper, for when the Apostle says that he received that from the Lord, he can mean nothing else than that he had received a special revelation on the subject. (Cf. Gal. i. 12). He might say of something spoken by Christ and communicated to himself by the other Apostles, that he had received it from the Lord, meaning only that he had received it *mediately*, but evidently the case is quite different when there is question of what the Lord *did*. The instruction regarding the Blessed Eucharist, therefore, which he had given the Corinthians when he was among them, was part of his Gospel, of which he writes to the Galatians : " For neither did I receive it from men, nor did I learn it ; but by the revelation of Jesus Christ " (Gal. i. 12). Evidently, then, the Apostle did not regard Himself as the founder of Christianity, as some Rationalists would have us believe he was ; he taught what he had received from Christ.—" The Lord Jesus " shows that to St. Paul Jesus was Lord, prior to His death or resurrection. By mentioning " the night on which He was being delivered up," the Apostle calls attention

* That ἀπό does not exclude immediate reception, see Gal. iii. 2 ; Col. i. 7 ; iii. 24, etc.

tradebatur accepit panem. the same night in which he was
²⁴ Et gratias agens fregit, et betrayed, took bread. ²⁴ And

to Christ's wonderful mercy and love in instituting at such a time this great Sacrament of love, which the Corinthians were now treating with so much ingratitude and irreverence.

24. The most probable text of this verse may be rendered :
 " and having given thanks, broke and said : this is My body which
 is for you : this do for the commemoration of Me." Thus the
 words " take ye and eat " must be omitted, with B K A C D E F G,
 many cursive MSS., and Fathers, It., Copt., Arm., and some of
 the oldest MSS. of the Vulgate. They were probably inserted
 here by some scribe from Matt. xxvi. 26. " Shall be delivered,"
 which renders the Vulgate " tradetur," must also go out, for it
 has only the Vulg. and Copt. versions and Theod. in its favour.
 The same must probably be said of another reading : " which is
 broken (κλωμενον) for you," for though strongly supported, being
 read in K³ C³ E F G K L P, many cursives, and in It., Syr. and Goth.
 versions, it has against it the powerful evidence of B K A C, and
 some of the Fathers, they reading simply : " which is for you."

" Having given thanks." Where St. Paul here, and St. Luke
 in the corresponding passage (Luke xxii. 17), have εὐχαριστήσας
 immediately before reference to the breaking of the bread, St.
 Matthew (xxvi. 26) and St. Mark (xiv. 22) have εὐλογήσας.
 SS. Paul and Luke admittedly refer to Christ's thanksgiving to
 His Father, but it is disputed what is meant by εὐλογήσας, whether
 "praise" (of the Father)—a meaning which the word always
 has in classical, and often in New Testament Greek (cf. Luke
 i. 24 ; ii. 28, etc.), or a "blessing" of the bread (cf. x. 16 ; Luke
 ix. 16). The latter view seems more probable, for the Council
 of Trent signifies that our Lord blessed the bread before He
 spoke the words : " This is My body " : " *Post panis vinique
 benedictionem se suum ipsius corpus illis præbere ac suum
 sanguinem disertis ac perspicuis verbis testatus est Dominus* "
 (Sess. xiii, *De Euchar.*, cap. 1), and there is no reference to the
 fact in the New Testament, unless it be in the εὐλογήσας of
 SS. Matthew and Mark. Moreover, the priest in Mass blesses
 the bread at the word " benedixit," before the consecration.
 The words of the Council seem to be opposed to the view of
 St. Thomas on this verse, that the blessing of the bread referred
 to by SS. Matthew and Mark is nothing else than the consecration
 itself. It is true, the aorist participle (εὐλογήσας) does not neces-

dixit : Accipite, et manducate : giving thanks, broke, and said :
 hoc est corpus meum, quod pro Take ye and eat : this is My

sarily imply that the time of the action indicated by the participle preceded that of the action indicated by the principal verb (cf. Matt. xxvi. 26 ; Acts i. 24 ; Col. ii. 13 ; Rom. iv. 20 ; Ephes. iv. 8), and hence the Evangelists might possibly have meant that our Lord blessed the bread *in* consecrating it ; but the Council seems to say that He blessed it *before* consecrating it, for the words : " disertis ac perspicuis verbis testatus est Dominus " can refer to nothing else than " This is My body " ; " This is My blood," etc., which, according to the Council, were spoken *after* the blessing. It seems best, therefore, to hold that our Lord both returned thanks and blessed the bread *before* the consecration.*

" Broke." Are we to hold that this breaking, which is mentioned in all the four accounts of the Institution, preceded the consecration ? Some say yes, and hold that there were two breakings, first into larger pieces, and later, after the consecration, into smaller. Others, as Estius, say we need not understand more than one breaking, and it after the consecration : " quandoquidem verbum *fregit*, quod apud omnes est, facile referri potest ad tempus prolationis verborum, quibus dictum est, quod pro vobis frangitur." In the Mass, the breaking of the sacred species does not take place till after the consecration, and it was this fact, apparently, which made St. Thomas anxious to hold that the blessing referred to by SS. Matthew and Mark, and mentioned before the breaking, was nothing else than the consecration.—The three parts into which the Host is divided in the Mass, typify perhaps the three parts of the Church : triumphant, militant, and suffering. Cf. St. Thomas on this verse.

" This is My body " : τοῦτό μου ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα instead of τοῦτό ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου, which the three Evangelists have ; from which we may learn that even in the most important texts inspiration does not guarantee that the precise form of words spoken is recorded. " Plainer words were never spoken. The proposition is both *assertive* and *operative*. It declares to us more distinctly than any imperative form, as—' Let this become My body '—that our Lord's body is really present ; and it is operative—that

* The words of the Canon of the Mass : " gratias agens, benedixit, fregit, deditque discipulis suis, dicens : accipite," etc., do not settle the question, as they might be understood, with St. Thomas, *Summa* 3, lxxviii. 1, Ad primum, as signifying that the pronouncing of the words of consecration was concurrent with all that goes before it. See Cornely, p. 338.

vobis tradetur : hoc facite in body which shall be delivered

is, it effects what it asserts. As in curing the Ruler's son, our Lord said : 'Thy son liveth,' and thereby wrought the cure, so His Almighty word affirms that His body is present, and causes it to be present. At the marriage feast of Cana, He might have said : 'This is wine,' and so changed the water into wine. His words here are not more difficult ; they effect what they signify and signify what they effect " (McCarthy on St. Matt. xxvi. 26).

St. Thomas tells us that some before his time held that Christ had consecrated the bread before He spoke the words " This is My body," and that the words were merely meant to inform the Apostles of the Transubstantiation which had been already effected ; but he at once rejects the view, and there is no doubt that it is opposed to the mind of the Church at all times, which has always taken the words as operative. Cf. Co. of Florence, *Decr. pro Jacobitis*, last paragraph. Denzinger's *Enchiridion*, 11th Ed., § 715.

That these words signify the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist is certain.

(1) This is the natural sense of the words, and it ought to be accepted unless it involve intrinsic impossibility or be shown from the circumstances to be excluded. But there is no intrinsic impossibility, as our dogmatic theologians prove in answering all the objections of opponents of the doctrine. Nor do the circumstances necessitate a figurative sense. On the contrary, the fact that Christ was speaking to His chosen Apostles a few hours before His death, leads us to expect that He spoke plainly and intelligibly. But He certainly would not have spoken so had He meant a figurative presence.

(2) The words have always from the beginning been understood in the Church as both signifying and effecting Christ's real presence.

(3) It is impious to suppose that our Lord, foreseeing all the worship that was to be paid to the Blessed Eucharist through so many centuries, would have used, on this last solemn occasion, language which suggested and necessitated belief in the real presence, and, if the Sacramentarians were right, the grossest idolatry.

(4) The endless differences of those who reject the literal sense, show that their views have no foundation in the text.

The words prove also the doctrine of Transubstantiation. For

me a m commemorationem. for you : this do for the com-

if the substance of bread remained, Christ could not have said " This is My body," but must have said : " In or with this is My body." One could not, in accordance with the use of language, hide a sovereign in a loaf, and holding up the loaf say : This is a sovereign. As long as the substance connatural to the accidents remains, the usage of speech forbids our ignoring the connatural substance. The substance of bread must, therefore, have passed away when Christ's words were completed ; but it passed away to give place to Christ's body, and we need not understand anything more than this by Transubstantiation.

The word " this," in the form of consecration, points to what is contained under the accidents when the operative sentence is completed. " Est ergo sensus," says St. Thomas *in loc.*, "*Hoc, id est, contentum sub his accidentibus, est corpus meum, et hoc est quod fit per verba consecrationis ; nam ante consecrationem id quod erat contentum sub his accidentibus, non erat corpus Christi, quod tamen fit corpus Christi per consecrationem.*"

Only the body of Christ is present under the species of bread, and only the blood under the species of wine, in virtue of the words of consecration. But as Christ's body is now a living body, even as it was at the Last Supper, and can die no more, wherever His body is, there also in virtue of natural concomitance must be His blood and His human soul ; and wherever His blood is, there also must be His body and His soul for the same reason ; and wherever His body with its blood and soul is, there also must be His Divinity in virtue of the hypostatic union.

" Which is for you." If we accept this reading (see above), διδόμενον or κλώμενον must be understood, and the meaning is that Christ's body is given in sacrifice or as food in the Blessed Eucharist. The Vulgate, indeed, by its use of the future tense " tradetur," seems to understand of the offering of Christ's body on Calvary, but SS. Matthew (xxvi. 28) and Mark (xiv. 24), in the corresponding words in reference to the blood, both have the present participle (ἐκχυνόμενον) : " which is poured out for you," and this most naturally refers to what took place at the time, during the Last Supper. Moreover, St. Luke represents Christ as saying : " This chalice is the new testament in My blood, which (chalice) is poured out for you " (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον . . . τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον), where the present participle ἐκχυν., in agreement with ποτήριον, naturally refers to it, so that what was

²⁵ Similiter et calicem, post- memoration of Me. = In like
quam coenavit, dicens : Hic manner also the chalice, after

contained in the chalice, and *formally as* contained in it, is said to have been poured out for the disciples, or as SS. Matthew and Mark have it, "for many." Similarly in the present text of St. Paul, the reference is to the body as in the Blessed Eucharist, and it is said either to be given in sacrifice (διδόμενον) for them, or to be distributed as food for their sakes. "Given for" is a common Scriptural phrase in reference to Christ's sacrifice for us (Gal. i. 4 ; ii. 20 ; Tit. ii. 14 ; 1 Tim. ii. 6 ; Rom. iv. 25 ; viii. 32, etc.), and if the true reading were : "which is given for you," there would be obvious direct reference to the sacrifice in the Eucharist. But even if the true reading be : "Which is for you," the sense can be nothing different, especially when we learn from the Evangelists that *at the Last Supper* (and not merely on Calvary) the blood was *poured out for many*. If the strongly supported κλάμενον were genuine, the sense would be, not that Christ's body was to be broken on the cross, for *de facto* it was not broken (John xix. 33, 36), but that it was given in food at the Last Supper. For Christ's body was present under the accidents of bread ; now, to "break bread" is a common Scriptural expression for giving food—"Break thy bread to the hungry" (Is. lviii. 1). "The little ones have asked for bread, and there was none to break it unto them" (Lam. iv. 4), etc.—and hence if Christ, while holding the accidents of bread in His hands, said : "This is My body which is broken for you," the natural sense would be that He was giving them His body as food ; moreover, it would be the only possible sense, seeing that His body was not broken on the cross.

"This do for the commemoration of Me." This is one of the comparatively few texts of Scripture, of which the Church has dogmatically defined the sense : "Si quis dixerit," says the Council of Trent (Sess. xxii., can. ii, *De Sacrif. Missae*), "illus verbis, Hoc facite in meam commemorationem, Christum non instituisse Apostolos sacerdotes ; aut non ordinasse ut ipsi alique sacerdotes offerrent corpus et sanguinem suum, anathema sit." "This" naturally refers to all that Christ had just done : the taking of bread, the thanksgiving, blessing, consecration, and distribution.

25. "In like manner," *i.e.*, as He did in the case of the bread,

calix novum testamentum est	He had supped, saying : This
in meo sanguine : hoc facite	chalice is the new testament in
quotiescumque bibetis, in meam	My blood : this do ye, as often
	as you shall drink, for the com-

so also He took the chalice, returned thanks to the Father, blessed, and distributed.

"After supper." It would be better to read "*coenatum est*" instead of the Vulg. "*coenavit*," as the Missal does : "*Simili modo postquam coenatum est.*" SS. Matthew and Mark say that Christ took the bread and distributed it while they were at supper ; St. Luke (xxii. 20, if the clause be genuine there) and St. Paul here, say that He took the chalice "after supper." From which some, as St. Thomas and Beelen, hold that the bread was consecrated and distributed during the supper, the chalice when it was over. Others, however, as Est., Just., Corn., hold that all four accounts may be best understood to mean that both species were consecrated and distributed in close succession, at the close of the meal, but before they rose from table. These writers contend that Matthew and Mark may merely mean that Christ began the Eucharistic supper, before He and the Apostles rose from the supper-table. St. Paul says nothing that conflicts with this. He first recalls in a general way the solemn occasion when the Blessed Eucharist was instituted : "the night on which He was being delivered up" ; then, in the words before us, defines the exact time, namely, when the Paschal and ordinary supper were over, but, as the presence of bread and wine implies, before they rose from the table.

"This chalice is the new testament in My blood." Similarly in St. Luke (xxii. 20), St. Paul's disciple, except that *terriv* is wanting there. SS. Matthew and Mark have the more obvious and simple form : "This is my blood of the (new ?) testament." The two forms agree substantially. The sense in SS. Matthew and Mark is : This is My blood by which the New Testament, or covenant is ratified ; in St. Paul : This chalice is (the ratification of—by metonymy) the New Testament, through My blood (which it contains). We cannot say with certainty whether any of the inspired accounts gives us the precise words used by Christ or only the substance, but the probability is in favour of St. Matthew's giving us the exact words, inasmuch as he was present at the supper. Either of the two forms proves the real presence of Christ's blood in the chalice, and there is even less room for

commemorationem. ²⁶ Quotiescumque enim manducabitis panem hunc, et calicem bibetis, mortem Domini annuntiabitis memoration of Me. ²⁸ For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the

a metaphorical sense and a merely spiritual presence than in the case of the bread. For our Lord's words are evidently meant to recall the ratification of the former covenant, when Moses, while sprinkling blood upon the people, said: "This is the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you" (Exod. xxiv. 8). As the words of Moses referred to blood that was really present, so the words of Christ, who was instituting a new covenant and whose words at once recall the words of Moses, must also be taken to refer to blood really present.

"This do, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of Me." St. Paul alone records these words in reference to the chalice. Like the words: "This do," etc., of v. 24, they show what our Lord intended to be the purpose of the Eucharistic banquets, and they were calculated to impress the Corinthians with the unworthiness of their own celebrations. The clause "as often as you shall drink" cannot be urged to prove that reception of the chalice, or communion under both kinds was to be optional. Christ spoke not to the faithful generally but to the Apostles, and the clause means that *whenever* they should receive the chalice, they ought to do so in commemoration of Christ. What commemoration is meant, the Apostle proceeds to point out in the next verse.

26. These are the words of the Apostle, as the reference to "the Lord" in the latter part of the verse shows. In the original the verbs are in the present tense. Though *καταγγέλλετε* might be the imperative mood, it is more probably indicative. The Eucharist is a commemoration of Christ's death, for it continues the sacrifice of Calvary, with the same Priest and Victim, and by the form of consecration represents Christ's body and blood as separated from each other, just as in His death; though, of course, as I explained above on v. 24, the now living and glorious Christ can be no longer really separated, but must be whole and entire, complete God-man under each species.

It is hardly necessary to say that the consecrated species is spoken of as bread, because of its having been bread, and because it still retains the appearance and other sensible qualities of bread.—"Until He come." "In quo datur intelligi quod hic

donec veniat. ²⁷ Itaque quicumque manducaverit panem hunc, vel biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis

Lord, until He come. ²⁷ Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the

ritus Ecclesiae non cessabit usque ad finem mundi " (St. Thom.).

While the words of Christ quoted in the preceding verse were spoken to the Apostles, the Apostle's words of this verse are addressed to the Church of Corinth, laity as well as clergy. It does not follow, however, that Communion under both kinds is necessary. The Apostle speaks of the Eucharistic rites as celebrated in his time and for long afterwards, when the laity did receive under both kinds, but the commemorative character of the Eucharist in relation to Christ's death is now maintained without Communion under both kinds not only in the separate consecration in the Mass, but also by the fact that it is the Body of Christ (not Christ Himself, though of course the entire Christ is present) the Priest offers to the faithful with the words: "Corpus D. N. J. C. custodiat animam tuam in vitam aeternam. Amen."

27. We take it that the Apostle concludes (ᾠστε) from what has been set forth in the preceding verses, *i.e.*, from the real presence of Christ's body and blood attested by the Lord Himself, and from the solemn commemorative character of the Eucharist similarly attested, the guilt of unworthy Communion. It is disputed whether he refers only to such unworthiness as arises from mortal sin, or includes also Communion that is less worthy on account of venial sin. In favour of the former are the strong words: "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," but greatly in favour of the latter are vv. 30-32, where, as we shall see, the Apostle speaks of the punishment of some unworthy communicants at Corinth, whose sin seems to have been only venial. Perhaps, as Cornely urges, a person can be said to be "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," that is, guilty of irreverence towards them and liable to punishment on account of this, though guilty only of venial irreverence, just as a person could be said to be guilty of *laesa Majestas*, though offending only slightly against his sovereign. At any rate, the Apostle's words imply the Real Presence, for a person could not be said to be *guilty of* the body and the (read τοῦ) blood of the Lord by treating with irreverence what was merely a sign of them.

et sanguinis Domini. ²⁸ Probet autem seipsum homo : et sic de pane illo edat, et de calice bibat. ²⁹ Qui enim manducat et bibit indigne, iudicium sibi blood of the Lord. ²⁸ But let a man prove himself : and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice. ²⁹ For he that eateth and drinketh un-

It is to be noted that the Apostle says that whosoever shall eat the bread *or* drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of both body and blood, a proof that both are contained under either species. The reading ἢ πινῆ (" *or* drink ") has overwhelming evidence in its favour, and hence the Revised Version has " *or* drink " instead of " *and* drink " of the Authorised Version. Since, then, both body and blood are here shown to be contained under either species, this verse has always been urged against the Utraquists as evidence that Communion under both kinds is not necessary. The essence of the Sacrament remains under one species, and it is a matter for the Church to decide whether the faithful are to receive under one or both.

28. But, in order to avoid being guilty of the body and blood of the Lord let a man test himself, *i.e.*, his conscience. It is assumed that if he do not find himself worthy he will take steps to make himself so, for obviously a mere inquiry into his condition would not make a man worthy if he were unworthy. Hence the Council of Trent (Sess. xiii., Cap. vii, *De Euchar.*) lays down : Quare communicare volenti revocandum est in memoriam ejus praeceptum : Probet seipsum homo. Ecclesiastica autem consuetudo declarat, eam probationem necessariam esse, ut nullus sibi conscius mortalis peccati quantumvis sibi contritus videatur, absque praemissa sacramentali confessione ad sacram Eucharistiam accedere debeat.* That this proving of oneself sometimes involves the confession of our sins to a priest, does not follow from this text, but it is implied in John xx. 23 and, as the Council of Trent says, learned from the tradition of the Church.—" And so let him eat," *i.e.*, after he has tested himself and found or secured that he is worthy, he may then lawfully and profitably receive the Blessed Eucharist.

29. Such proving of oneself is necessary, for otherwise we bring down upon ourselves an adverse judgment. The words " unworthily " and " of the Lord " are wanting in the four oldest Greek MSS., and it is difficult to account for such omission if

* Cf. also *ibid.*, Can. vii.

manducat et bibit: non di- worthily, eateth and drinketh
 iudicans corpus Domini. ³⁰ Ideo judgment to himself, not dis-
 inter vos multi infirmi et imbe- cerning the body of the Lord.
 cilles, et dormiunt multi. ³⁰ Therefore are there many

they were genuine. Hence though they rightly complete the sense, we regard them as probably very early interpolations. The verse makes good sense without them: For he who eats and drinks brings condemnation upon himself by his eating and drinking, if he distinguish not the body from other food. The whole context shows that the body in question can be no other than the Lord's, which has been mentioned immediately before, while no other body is referred to in the chapter.

Instead of "not distinguishing the body" (from other food), some prefer to give to μή διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα the sense "if he judge not rightly of the body," i.e., as St. Chrysostom puts it, "if he does not reflect on the greatness of what is put before him," and this sense of "judging rightly" seems to suit better the same verb in v. 31. Κρίμα is not a neutral word here, but, as the context shows, a sentence of condemnation; though not necessarily a sentence of eternal damnation such as is expressed by κατακρίνω in v. 32.

30. Since judgment follows upon the unworthy reception of the Eucharist, "therefore many among you are infirm and weak, and a considerable number (ἰκανοί) sleep" (in death). We cannot be sure what is the difference between ἀσθενεῖς and ἄρρωστοί, nor even if serious illness is meant. The fact, however, that so grave a punishment as death is mentioned immediately after, justifies us in concluding that at least some of the illnesses were serious. Κοιμῶνται ("sleep") is used, in the transferred sense, of death (1 Thess. iv. 13; Matt. xxvii. 52; John xi. 11, etc.). It is employed in this sense in ten other places in the New Testament, always of those who died in the Lord, and are destined for a glorious resurrection. We cannot, therefore, take it in any other sense here, and hence there is question not of eternal death, but of premature departure from this world, of temporal punishment, inflicted for unworthy Communion. This rather favours the view that venial irreverence is included in v. 27; though, of course, it is possible that the people referred to here had been guilty of grave sacrilege but had repented, and that their sickness and premature death were the temporal punishment due for mortal sins, the guilt of which had been previously forgiven.

³¹ Quod si nosmetipsos diiudicaremus, non utique iudicemur. ³² Dum iudicamur autem, a Domino corripimur, ut non cum hoc mundo damnemur.

■ Itaque fratres mei, cum convenitis ad manducandum, invicem expectate. ³⁴ Si quis

infirm and weak among you, and many sleep. ³¹ But if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged. ³² But whilst we are judged, we are chastised by the Lord; that we be not condemned with this world.

³³ Wherefore, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. ³⁴ If any

31. But if (εἰ ὅτι, not εἰ γάρ) we judged ourselves rightly, i.e., if we took a proper estimate of our spiritual condition, and took steps to better it if necessary, we should not be judged. The Apostle uses the first person, partly because doubtless he was conscious of the imperfection of his own preparation for so august a Sacrament, and partly to soften the rebuke implied in his words.

32. But now, as things are, and in view of our imperfect preparation, in being judged we are chastised by the Lord, to the end that we may not be eternally condemned with the wicked world. *Κόσμος* here is the wicked world, as usually in St. John, e.g., John xvii. 9, 14, etc.

33. The Apostle now returns to the abuses in connection with the *Agape*, abuses which were so unworthy of an occasion when the Blessed Eucharist was to be received, and which on account of their close connection with the Blessed Eucharist, had led him to speak of the latter. He has specially in mind their not waiting for each other in this common meal, this love-feast (v. 21), which thus ceased to have the character of a love-feast. "Wherefore," he says, "when you come together to eat (in these love-feasts), wait for one another." Thus the rich would be saved from the danger of having too much, while the poor would no longer be left hungry and indignant. Those like P. Batiffol, who hold that St. Paul forbids a feast of any kind in connection with the Blessed Eucharist, utterly fail, in our opinion, to give any satisfactory explanation of this verse.

34. Lest anyone should plead hunger as an excuse for not waiting, he tells such a one to eat at home. The love-feast was not meant to satisfy hunger but to foster charity. There is no ground here for saying that the Blessed Eucharist was at this

esurit, domi manducet : ut non in iudicium conveniatis. Cetera autem, cum venero, disponam.

man be hungry, let him eat at home ; that you come not together unto judgment. And the rest I will set in order, when I come.

time received fasting, or that the Apostle tells those who could not fast to eat at home, and abstain from receiving the Blessed Eucharist on the occasion. The text simply means that when they *came together to eat*, i.e., when they met in the love-feast, they ought to conduct themselves as at a love-feast, where fellowship and charity ought to reign. As we said already on v. 16, the Corinthians celebrated at the same meeting the love-feast and the Blessed Eucharist ; thus imitating our Lord's Last Supper, when the Paschal Supper, an ordinary supper, and the Eucharistic Supper were combined. At Corinth the love-feast preceded the Eucharist, and at it the abuse of not waiting for each other occurred. The text affords no ground, then, for saying that each one partook of the Eucharist when he wished without waiting for its consecration, nor any evidence that there was not someone presiding at the Eucharistic rite. As our Lord presided, and consecrated the Blessed Eucharist at the Last Supper, and authorised the Apostles to repeat the rite for the commemoration of Him, we may take it that at first an Apostle usually presided. But as the Apostles could not be everywhere, and as they were soon to pass away in death while the Eucharistic celebration was to last as long as the Church (v. 26), other consecrating ministers, that is, other priests must have been very soon appointed, and one of them presided at the celebration.

"And the rest I will set in order whensoever I come." Probably other points in connection with the *Agape* and the Eucharist are meant by "the rest." The Apostle says that he will supplement his written word by oral instruction, an evidence for the truth of the Catholic teaching that Scripture must be supplemented by tradition ; in other words, that the Bible is not the whole rule of faith. "Ex quo patet," says St. Thomas on this verse, "quod Ecclesia multa habet ex dispositione Apostolorum quae in sacra Scriptura non continentur." It is strange that there is no allusion to a local superior in Corinth ; yet there must have been someone, probably several, whether bishops or priests, able to consecrate the Blessed Eucharist. See below on xii. 28 and Introd., p. xvii.

CHAPTER XII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Apostle, beginning here to treat of charisms, first reminds the Corinthians of their former wretched blind condition, and then lays down a twofold test by which they may generally know whether those seeming to be endowed with charisms are influenced by the Spirit of God (vv. 1-3) ; next he points out the unity of origin and purpose in all the charisms (4-11), and shows that since all are intended to promote the good of the Church, Christ's mystical body, everyone ought to be content with the charism he had received and not covet a higher (12-20) ; nay, the weaker or less important members are often more necessary, and hence no one ought to despise those who are endowed with what seem to be less important charisms, but complete union and sympathy ought to exist in Christ's mystical body as in the human body (21-31).

Having dealt with the question of the head-dress of women in the liturgical assemblies, and with that of abuses connected with the love-feasts, the Apostle now proceeds (see above on xi. 1) to treat of those spiritual gifts which are commonly referred to as *gratiae gratis datae*, i.e., spiritual gifts intended for the benefit, not of the recipients, but of others. He first treats of the origin and utility of these gifts (xii. 1-30) ; then lest too much importance should be attached to them, he eulogises charity and declares it far superior to them all (xii. 31-xiii. 13) ; next he compares the gift of prophecy with the gift of tongues and shows prophecy to be superior (xiv. 1-25) ; and finally he gives some practical directions for the use of these gifts in the liturgical assemblies at Corinth.

The Apostle's language shows that miraculous spiritual gifts were exceedingly common in Corinth at this time. In the first years of the Church God deigned to water, as it were, the plant of the faith by abundant visible outpourings of the Holy Spirit. But the whole passage is obscure for us, as it was already for St. Chrysostom, from the fact that these visible outpourings of the Holy Ghost have almost entirely ceased.

¹ De spiritualibus autem,
 nolo vos ignorare fratres.
² Scitis quoniam cum gentes
 essetis, ad simulacra muta
 prout ducebamini euntes. ³ Ideo

¹ Now concerning spiritual
 things, my brethren, I would
 not have you ignorant. ² You
 know that, when you were
 heathens, you went to dumb
 idols, according as you were
 led. ³ Wherefore I give you to

1. If we compare with vii. 1; viii. 1, we may infer that the Corinthians had questioned the Apostle regarding these spiritual gifts. The opposition implied in the $\delta\epsilon$ signifies that though he was satisfied to leave some matters untouched till he should visit Corinth (xi. 34), yet he would not leave them in ignorance about these spiritual gifts. Πνευματικῶν is neuter, not masculine, for it is chiefly of gifts, not persons, that the section treats; the gifts are so called because they are preternatural and proceed from the Holy Spirit (Πνεῦμα).

2. This verse shows what we know otherwise (Acts xviii. 6-7), that the bulk of the Corinthian Church was made up of converted Gentiles. The best supported reading is: οἴδατε ὅτι ὅτε ("ye know that when"), neither ὅτι alone, nor ὅτε alone. Something must be supplied to make the sentence grammatically complete, probably ἦτε with ἀπογόμενοι. "Ye know that when ye were Gentiles, ye were led away, as (from time to time) ye might be led, to the idols that are dumb." Nothing would have to be supplied if we could accept Westc.-Hort's conjectural emendation of πότε ("formerly") for ὅτε, for the sense would then be: "Ye know that formerly ye were Gentiles, led away, as (from time to time) ye might be led, to the idols that are dumb"; but it is merely an unsupported conjecture, nor do we believe it at all likely that the Apostle would think it necessary to remind them that once they were Gentiles. The ὅν in ὡς ὅν ἡγισθε probably has an iterative force, signified above by "from time to time" (Cf. J. H. Moulton's *Gramm. of N. T. Greek*, p. 167).

Before instructing them regarding the spiritual gifts, he parenthetically reminds them of their former sad condition, in which they were led away from God to the idols that could impart no instruction. He does not say by whom they were led; doubtless the devil, but possibly also custom. The clause: "as (from time to time) ye might be led," seems thrown in to emphasise their helplessness.

3. "Wherefore" is best connected with: "I would not have

notum vobis facio, quod nemo in Spiritu Dei loquens, dicit anathema Iesu. Et nemo potest dicere, Dominus Iesus, nisi in Spiritu sancto.

understand, that no man speaking by the spirit of God, saith Anathema to Jesus. And no man can say, the Lord Jesus, but by the Holy Ghost.

you ignorant" of v. 1; though many connect with v. 2 in this way: Ye know that formerly ye were led away to dumb idols who could give you no instruction as to how to judge of extraordinary spiritual manifestations; but since such a condition is unworthy of Christians, "wherefore," etc. But this seems forced, while a parenthesis in v. 2 is natural, and the connection with v. 1 is clear and simple. What he gives them to understand is that no man speaking in the Spirit of God saith: Jesus is anathema (read ἡσούς; with B & A C); and no man can say: Jesus is Lord (again ἡσούς; is to be read), but by the Holy Ghost. He lays down a general principle, by which they may judge of all these extraordinary gifts, whether they are from God or not. If those who profess or appear to be endowed with some extraordinary gift, blaspheme Jesus, they are not moved by the Holy Ghost; if, on the other hand, they acknowledge Christ's Divinity, it is the Holy Ghost that moves them. The first part of this principle is clear, for of course no one moved by the Holy Ghost could blaspheme Jesus; but it is not so easy to see how everyone who confessed Jesus to be Lord was thereby shown to be moved by the Holy Spirit. Did not the devils themselves confess Christ's Divinity (Mark i. 24; iii. 12, etc.), and did not Jesus Himself declare that not everyone that saith to Him, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven? (Matt. vii. 21). And might not a false prophet, for instance, pretend to accept Christ's Divinity, while he really rejected it? Many reply that the Apostle speaks of those who *honestly and sincerely* confess Christ's Divinity, and lays down that such are moved by the Holy Ghost. But the difficulty against such explanation is that the Corinthian Christians could not read a man's soul to know whether he was sincere or not; and if they could not, how did the Apostle's test help them? We think it most probable that the Apostle did not mean the test he gives to be absolutely decisive in every case. He lays down a general principle which would be found to be decisive in most cases: whoever appears to have an extraordinary gift, or *charism*, yet blasphemes Christ, is not moved by the Holy Spirit; but whoever confesses Christ's Divinity is moved by the

⁴ Divisiones vero gratiarum sunt, idem autem Spiritus. ⁵ Et divisiones ministratorum sunt, idem autem Dominus. ⁶ Et divisiones operationum sunt, idem vero Deus qui operatur

⁴ Now there are diversities of graces, but the same Spirit; ⁵ And there are diversities of ministries, but the same Lord. ⁶ And there are diversities of operations, but the same God,

Holy Spirit. This twofold principle would be a general guide for the Corinthians; if in some cases there might be need to judge of hypocrites who merely feigned acceptance of Christ's Lordship and Divinity, they could be detected and exposed by those who had the gift of "discernment of spirits." Indeed, the existence of this gift implies that the test supplied by the Apostle here is not meant to be absolutely decisive in every case. The Apostle, therefore, gives what may be described as a rough test for judging of extraordinary gifts.

From what has been said, it is evident that there is no question in this verse of the necessity of grace for a salutary act. It is true, and proved from other passages of Scripture (*e.g.*, John xv. 5) that grace is necessary for every salutary act, but in the present verse St. Paul is speaking of the origin of extraordinary gifts, and supplying a test whether they are from the Holy Ghost or not.—"Anathema" (ἀνάθεμα from ἀνατίθεμαι, "to set up") is the Hellenistic form of the Attic ἀνάθημα. The word was first applied to offerings, such as wreaths, swords, etc., *hung up* in the temples in honour of the gods (*e.g.*, Luke xxi. 5). Then it came to be used of a person or thing devoted to destruction in honour of the gods or of the true God, and in this sense of "devoted to destruction," "accursed," the form ἀνάθεμα is always found in the New Testament. Similar is the ecclesiastical use of the word in the canons of Councils.

4-6. He passes on now to speak of the variety in unity of these spiritual gifts, their variety in themselves, their unity in their source and purpose. Διαιρέσεις might mean either "varieties" or "distributions"; the antithesis: "but the same Spirit" shows that the former is the meaning. The Holy Spirit divides (v. 11) His gifts among men, giving different gifts to different people, and as a result there are varieties, or diversities of gifts. The Greeks take "graces" (v. 4), "ministries" or "ministrations," (v. 5), and "operations" (v. 6) to be different names for the same spiritual gifts, and attempt in various ways to explain how, under one name, they are appropriated to the Holy Ghost, under

omnia in omnibus. ⁷ Unicuique autem datur manifestatio Spiritus ad utilitatem. ⁸ Alii quidem per Spiritum datur sermo who worketh all in all. ⁷ And the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man unto profit. ⁸ To one indeed, by the

another to the Son, and under another to the Father. Others, as Cornely, say that in vv. 5-6 the Apostle brings forward two analogies to help the Corinthians to understand how various gifts may come from the one Holy Spirit (v. 4), namely, that, as they knew, there are various ministries (of Apostles, Bishops, Deacons, etc.), in the Church, yet all ordained by the same Christ; and various effects (ἐνέργημα) produced in the world, yet all proceeding from the same first cause, God the Father.

But if the Apostle meant vv. 5-6 to illustrate v. 4, he has certainly given no indication of it, though he could easily have done so by inserting "even as" or something of the sort in the beginning of v. 5. We prefer, then, to hold that "graces" refers to the gifts themselves, "ministries," or "ministrations" (διδασκαλίαν) to the services rendered by those who possessed the gifts, "operations" to the effects, or results of these services. For instance, the grace of healing would be a χάρισμα, the exercise of it would be a διδασκαλία; the cure or result produced would be an ἐνέργημα. The gifts are various, but all from the same Spirit; the services are various, and all for the same Lord Jesus, whose glory they promote; the results are various, yet all from the same God the Father, who is the first cause of all things in all men, or even in all creatures. St. Thomas, on this verse, says: "Quod dicit, *Spiritus*, potest referri ad personam Spiritus Sancti: quod dicit, *Dominus*, ad personam Filii: quod dicit, *Deus*, ad personam Patris. Vel haec tria possunt attribui Spiritui Sancto, qui est Dominus Deus."

7. The first and last words in the original are emphatic—to each for the common good. Πνεύματος is probably the objective genitive: "that which manifests the Spirit," rather than the subjective: "the manifestation which the Spirit produces."

8-10. Nine charisms are now enumerated. If we compare v. 28; Rom. xii. 6-8; Eph. iv. 11, where similar enumerations occur, we must conclude, against St. Thomas, that the present enumeration is not intended to be exhaustive. There is great diversity of opinion as to the precise nature of some of the charisms here mentioned, and there is even question whether the Apostle by ϕ (v. 8), $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega$ (v. 9), $\epsilon\rho\epsilon\omega$ (v. 10) meant to distribute

sapientiae: alii autem sermo scientiae secundum eundem Spiritum: ⁸ Alteri fides in eodem Spiritu: alii gratia sanitatum in uno Spiritu: ¹⁰ Alii operatio virtutum, alii pro-

Spirit, is given the word of wisdom: and to another, the word of knowledge, according to the same Spirit. ⁸ To another, faith in the same Spirit: to another, the grace of healing in one Spirit: ¹⁰ To another, the

them into three classes. The twice recurring ἐτέρω (ordinarily meaning another of a different kind, as distinct from ἄλλος, which denotes merely numerical distinction) might seem to point to this, but it may be that it is used merely to avoid the repetition of ἄλλω eight times in succession. If ἐτέρω be taken to denote in each case a new class, then we have the two gifts mentioned in v. 8—the “word of wisdom,” and the “word of knowledge”—pertaining to the first class; the five immediately following to the second class; finally the (diverse) “kinds of tongues,” and “interpretation of tongues” to the third class. The first pair might fairly be thus classed together as intended for the instruction of the faithful, also the last pair—“tongues” and the “interpretation of them”—as facilitating that instruction, but it is very hard to find any ground for grouping together the five gifts that stand in the second class, for “prophecy,” as the Apostle understands it (below, chap. xiv), seems to have nothing in common with the “gift (Greek, ‘gifts’) of healings.” Hence many commentators hold that no such classification is intended, or at any rate that with our present knowledge, or rather ignorance, of the gifts in question, we cannot satisfactorily account for it.

Note in v. 8 that it is not wisdom and knowledge, but the *word* of each that is referred to, i.e., the *charismata* consist in the power to impart to others wisdom and knowledge respectively. The “word of wisdom” is perhaps superior to the “word of knowledge,” the former being probably the faculty of teaching and explaining the mysteries and deeper truths of religion (cf. iii. 6); the latter that of teaching and explaining the ordinary truths which every Christian ought to know.

In v. 9 “faith” is not to be understood of theological faith, though that is supposed, but of a wonder-working faith, which superadds to ordinary faith a special confidence that God is able and willing on any particular occasion to manifest His power by a miracle (cf. Matt. xvii. 20; Mark xi. 20). This faith is said to

phetia, alii discretio spirituum,	working of miracles: to another,
alii genera linguarum, alii	prophecy: to another, the dis-
interpretatio sermonum.	cerning of spirits: to another,
	diverse kinds of tongues: to
	another, interpretation of

be given in the same Spirit, while the "word of wisdom" was said to be given *through* the Spirit, and the "word of knowledge" *according* to the same Spirit. "Adnotemus oportet (says Corn.), Apostolum variare praepositiones (διὰ, κατὰ, ἐν), ut quomodo dona haec a Spiritu S. dependeant, omni ex parte clarius innotescat: per eum dantur et secundum ejus voluntatem (καθὼς βούλεται, v. 11) distribuuntur, quia in eo communem suum fontem habent et plerumque quoque in eo dantur, quia seipsum fidelibus dans dona sua secum affert."

After "faith," there follow in the enumeration "gifts of healings" (χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων), and "workings of miracles" (ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων), which some take to be two species contained under the genus of wonder-working "faith"; while others prefer to regard them as distinct from "faith," and remind us that some miracles were wrought, while the saints in whose honour they were wrought were unconscious of the fact, and hence had no special faith in God's miraculous intervention on the occasion. Thus St. Luke tells us that the people expected miracles from the shadow of St. Peter, and obtained them through handkerchiefs that had touched St. Paul (Acts v. 15; xix. 12). In this view, "gifts of healings" refers to the unconscious healing of *diseases* (the plurals indicating that one man might have the gift of curing more than one disease), and "workings of miracles" or rather "effects of mighty powers" (ἐνεργήματα δυνάμεων) to other miracles, such as the expulsion of demons, wrought unconsciously. Next follow in the enumeration "prophecy" and "discernment of spirits." "Prophecy," which is discussed at length in chapter xiv, is not to be understood merely of the prediction of what was to come, though certainly it sometimes included that, but of the gift of *exhorting* the faithful under a special Divine influence. "Discernment of spirits" was a gift enabling the possessor to tell whether certain persons were moved by the good or evil spirit, and thus enabling them to detect false prophets and impostors. Lastly, the Apostle closes the list with "to another (τρίτῳ) kinds of tongues," "to another (ἄλλῳ) interpretation of tongues," denoting in the first case the gift of speaking

¹¹ Haec autem omnia operatur unus atque idem Spiritus, dividens singulis prout vult.

¹² Sicut enim corpus unum est, et membra habet multa, omnia autem membra corporis cum sint multa, unum tamen corpus sunt: ita et Christus.

¹³ Etenim in uno Spiritu omnes nos in unum corpus baptizati sumus, sive Iudaei, sive Gentiles, sive servi, sive liberi: et omnes in uno Spiritu potati

speeches. ¹¹ But all these things one and the same Spirit worketh, dividing to every one according as he will.

¹² For as the body is one, and hath many members; and all the members of the body, whereas they are many, yet are one body; so also is Christ.

¹³ For in one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews, or Gentiles, whether bond, or free: and in one Spirit we have all been made to drink.

in strange tongues (see below on xiv. 1 ff.), and in the second the gift of interpreting them.

11. The pagans used to seek different benefits from different gods, but here the one and the same Spirit is the author of all the gifts, "dividing to each *severally* (ἰδίᾳ being taken adverbially) even as He willeth." The verse shows that the Holy Spirit is a Person, able to work and will; and that He distributes the gifts in question not according to the merits of men, but according to His own free choice.

12. By an illustration drawn from the human body the Apostle shows that variety of members is consistent with unity in the mystical body of Christ. Τοῦ ἑνός, read by some authorities after σώματος, must be omitted. Ἦν may retain its ordinary force, for vv. 12, 13 show that all Christians are united in one mystical body, and this makes it easier to understand how one Spirit can influence them all (v. 11). Instead of "so also is the Christ," we might have expected "so also is the Church," for that it is of the Church he is thinking is proved by "all we" in the following verse, and by verse 27. But to throw into prominence the unity of the Church, he identifies her with Christ Her Head. The meaning, therefore, is that the Church is one (mystical) body with many members. This unity is proved in the next verse.

13. For through one Spirit we were all baptized into one body (the Church), whatever our racial or social differences, and we were all made to drink of one Spirit (so that we have, as it were, a common soul). The aorist ἐκρίσθημεν, pointing as it does to some one definite past occasion, cannot refer to the reception of the Blessed Eucharist, which would be often repeated, nor to

sumus. ¹⁴ Nam et corpus non est unum membrum, sed multa.

¹⁵ Si dixerit pes : Quoniam non sum manus, non sum de corpore : num ideo non est de corpore ? ¹⁶ Et si dixerit auris :

Quoniam non sum oculus, non sum de corpore : num ideo non est de corpore ? ¹⁷ Si totum corpus oculus, ubi auditus ? Si totum auditus, ubi odoratus ?

¹⁸ Nunc autem posuit Deus membra, unumquodque eorum in corpore sicut voluit. ¹⁹ Quod si essent omnia unum membrum, ubi corpus ? ²⁰ Nunc autem multa quidem membra, unum autem corpus.

¹⁴ For the body also is not one member, but many. ¹⁵ If the foot should say, because I am not the hand, I am not of the body : is it therefore not of the body ? ¹⁶ And if the ear should say, because I am not the eye, I am not of the body : is it therefore not of the body ? ¹⁷ If the whole body were the eye : where would be the hearing ? If the whole were hearing : where would be the smelling ? ¹⁸ But now God hath set the members every one of them in the body as it hath pleased him. ¹⁹ And if they all were one member, where would be the body ? ²⁰ But now *there are* many members indeed, yet one body.

the habitual reception of grace, but most probably alludes to the abundant graces received in Confirmation, which Sacrament then, as even now among the Greeks, was conferred immediately after Baptism. The εἰς read before ἐν πνεύματι in some texts, goes out. Ἐν πνεύματι is the accusative after ἐποτρ., which, taking two accusatives after it in the active voice (γὰρ ἡ ὑμεῖς ἐπὶ τῷ πνεύματι, iii. 2), retains one in the passive.

14. Having shown in v. 13 that the Church is one body, and hence that the comparison of v. 12 is justified, he now emphasises what he stated already in v. 12, that the human body is not one member, but many. "For also" (καὶ γάρ) the human body, like Christ's mystical body, with its various members endowed with various spiritual gifts, is not one member but many ; and thus the analogy is complete ; in both cases there is one body and many members.

15-20. Having thus established the ground of comparison, he goes on to point out (vv. 15-20) the relation of its members to the human body, leaving the Corinthians to draw the conclusion as to what ought to be their relations to the body of Christ, the Church. The passage recalls the fable of Menenius Agrippa recorded by Livy (*Hist.* ii. 23), with which St. Paul was

²¹ Non potest autem oculus dicere manui : Opera tua non indigeo ; aut iterum caput pedibus : Non estis mihi necessarii. ²² Sed multo magis quae videntur membra corporis infirmiora

²¹ And the eye cannot say to the hand : I need not thy help ; nor again the head to the feet : I have no need of you. ²² Yea, much more those that seem to be the more feeble members of

very probably acquainted. The less noble members are as much a part of the body as the more noble (vv. 15, 16) ; were the whole body one member, even though of the noblest kind, appropriate instruments would be wanting for the different functions, a thing which God, the Author of nature, has taken care not to allow (vv. 17, 18) ; nay, were all one member, there could be no body (compacted of different parts), such as *de facto* there is (vv. 19, 20).

In v. 15 the less noble member is conceived of as envying one not very much superior to itself ; as the foot, the hand, and not the eye, for we less frequently envy those who are very far above us. Instead of : " is it therefore not of the body ? " many prefer to render : " it is not therefore *not* of the body ? " for the clause in the Greek text contains two negatives. If the clause was meant to be taken interrogatively, the double negative was certainly not necessary, though it may be possible to explain it as employed by the Apostle for emphasis.

21. Having considered the relations of the members to the body, he now proceeds to consider their relations to each other, still intending his readers to apply his words to the mystical body of Christ and its members. If the preceding verses were meant to warn those Christians who were endowed with lower gifts against envy and grumbling, the present verse and those that follow are calculated to repress pride and contempt in those endowed with the higher. The eye and the hand, and still more the head and the feet, are far apart in dignity ; yet the highest cannot say to the lowest that they are unnecessary.

22. The meaning of this verse depends upon what is meant by " those that seem to be the weaker members." If ἀσθενέστερα has here the sense of less important, as Grimm (*Lex.*) understands it, then the verse means : Yea, much *rather* those that seem to be the less important members of the body (as the hands and feet) are necessary (" *necessaria* " instead of " *necessariora* " in Vulg.) ; so far are they from being unnecessary, as the words at the end of the preceding verse would have it, much rather are

esse, necessariora sunt : ²³ Et quae putamus ignobiliora membra esse corporis, his honorem abundantiorem circumdamus : et quae inhonesta sunt nostra, abundantiorem honestatem habent. ²⁴ Honesti autem nostri nullius egent : sed Deus temperavit corpus, ei cui deerat,

the body, are more necessary. ²³ And such as we think to be the less honourable members of the body, about these we put more abundant honour : and those that are our uncomely parts, have more abundant comeliness. ²⁴ But our comely parts have no need : but God

they really necessary. But if, as many understand, "those that seem to be the weaker members," are members *that require most protection*, as the brain, lungs, etc., then the Apostle is here speaking of different members from those mentioned in v. 21, and urging a new consideration, namely, that the weaker members are much *more* (μᾶλλον, in this view meaning "more") necessary than the stronger.

23. What parts are meant by : "such as we think to be the less honourable (members) of the body," the Apostle does not say ; but by the words "such as we think," he probably hints that they may differ in different countries, as the breast, arms, legs, etc.

But there are other parts about which there is no room for difference of opinion, nature teaching all to cover them, and these uncomely (parts) receive from us more abundant comeliness of covering. Ἀσχημονα, which the Authorised and Revised Versions as well as ours render "uncomely," is represented by "inhonesta" in the Vulgate, and St. Augustine, though he at first understood it in the sense of uncomely, afterwards in his *Retractations* ii. 7, preferred to render it "inhonesta," holding that the Apostle so designated those parts of the body "propter legem scilicet in membris repugnantem legi mentis ; quae de peccato accidit, non de prima nostra institutione naturae." So too St. Thomas on this verse : "Dicuntur autem membra aliqua inhonesta in sanctis non propter aliquam peccati turpitudinem, sed propter inobedientiam membrorum genitalium subsecutam ex peccato originali."

24. The first clause of this verse might have been more appropriately included in v. 23. The two aorists, συνεκέντησεν and δοῦς, are contemporaneous, and refer to creation, δοῦς referring to the Divine ordinance, which men guided by natural instinct carry out by clothing some parts of the body and leaving others

abundantiorem tribuendo honorem, ²⁵ Ut non sit schisma in corpore, sed idipsum pro invicem sollicita sint membra. ²⁶ Et si quid patitur unum membrum, compatiuntur omnia membra : sive gloriatur unum membrum, congaudent omnia membra. ²⁷ Vos autem estis corpus Christi, et membra de

hath tempered the body together, giving to that which wanted the more abundant honour. ²⁵ That there might be no schism in the body, but the members might be mutually careful one for another. ²⁶ And if one member suffer anything, all the members suffer with it : or if one member glory, all the members rejoice with it. ²⁷ Now you are the body of Christ, and

unclothed. "Temperavit," like the Greek verb, means that God combined together the various parts of the body.

25. God so provided to the end that there might be no disunion but complete sympathy between the different parts of the body. Μεριμᾶσθαι implies anxious care, anxious sympathy.

26. "And so (as a result of this balanced combination of parts) whether one member suffer, all the members suffer with it," etc. Instead of εἴτε ("sive"), some early authorities read εἰ τι, represented by the Vulg. "si quid," but εἴτε has more authority. Δοξάζεσθαι ("gloriatur") seems to mean "is honoured" or "pleased." Thus when the eye is pleased by a beautiful landscape or the ear by sweet music, all the body shares in the pleasure.

27. This is, as it were, the minor of a syllogism : a body ought to be such as I have just indicated ; "now you are (a) body of Christ," etc. "Plerumque quidem universalis Ecclesia corpus Christi vocatur (Eph. i. 23 ; iv. 12 ; v. 30 ; Col. i. 24, etc.) ; sed sicut particularis ecclesia *templum Dei* (ναὸς θεοῦ, iii. 16 ; sine articulo) apte appellatur, licet universalis Ecclesia sit ὁ ναὸς θεοῦ suo modo etiam eidem particulari ecclesiae, utpote universalis imagini cuidam, nomen σώματος Χριστοῦ (sed sine articulo, uti hic) jure attribuitur" (Corn.).

The Vulgate "et membra de membro" represents a Greek reading καὶ μὴ ἐκ μέλους, but the evidence is decisively in favour of καὶ μὴ ἐκ μέρους = "et membra *ex parte*," This means either that they were members each in his assigned part, or, more probably, that taken severally, individually (ἐκ μέρους) they were members. Grimm (*Lex.*) says that ἐκ μέρους, "si ad singulos (singula) respicitur" means "*singuli*" and he gives as an instance this passage. Thus the meaning of the whole verse is, that, taken together, they were a body of Christ, and taken severally

membro. ²⁸ Et quosdam quidem posuit Deus in ecclesia primum apostolos, secundo prophetas, tertio doctores, deinde virtutes, exinde gratias members of member. ²⁸ And God indeed hath set some in the church, first apostles, secondly prophets, thirdly doctors, after that miracles,

they were members. The Vulgate rendering might be explained, as St. Thomas in his third explanation suggests: "*ita distinguimini et ordinamini ad invicem, sicut unum membrum ad aliud,*" i.e., though endowed with various gifts, they were related to one another as one member of a body to another.

28. He proceeds to show how severally they are members destined for different functions by pointing out that as God at creation placed differently endowed members in the body (v. 18), so also in constituting the Church He placed (aor. mid.; placed for His own wise purposes) in it members endowed with different gifts. The question is still of extraordinary gifts, for prophecy and miracles are not included in the ordinary ministry of the Church, nor would the Apostle who several years before this letter was written had appointed "*presbyters*" in every church he had founded in Asia Minor (Acts xiv. 22; cf. also Acts xx. 17; Phil. i. 1; 1 Thess. v. 12; Tit. i. 5) have omitted to speak of bishops and deacons or priests and deacons, had he been referring to the ordinary ministry of the Church. If there is no mention in this Epistle of local superiors, whether bishops or priests, in Corinth, I believe that at least a partial explanation is that the letter of the Corinthians (vii. 1) had been forwarded to the Apostle from the local superiors, and that this Epistle was sent to the Church through the same superiors, and so their presence and authority in Corinth might readily be taken for granted.

"The Church" is the universal Church, not the church of Corinth. Eight *gifts* are referred to; the ninth: "*interpretationes sermonum*" ("*interpretations of speeches*"), which stands in our Vulgate at the end of the verse, is wanting here according to nearly all Greek as well as the older Latin MSS. It is just possible, however, in the light of vv. 10 and 30, where it occurs, that it may be genuine and have been omitted very early through homœoteleuton, i.e., the fact that the preceding clause and this both ended with *γλωσσῶν*. "*Apostles*" probably neither are nor include the Twelve, who were the *ordinary* ministers appointed by Christ for the propagation of the Gospel, but others endowed with an extraordinary gift, probably the gift of the "*word of*

curationum, opitulationes, gubernationes, genera linguarum, interpretationes sermonum.

²⁸ Numquid omnes apostoli?

numquid omnes prophetae?

numquid omnes doctores?

²⁹ Numquid omnes virtutes?

numquid omnes gratiam habent

then the graces of healings, helps, governments, kinds of tongues, interpretations of speeches. ²⁸ Are all apostles?

Are all prophets? Are all

doctors? ²⁹ Are all *workers* of

miracles? Have all the grace

wisdom," whose business it was to break new ground and preach the Gospel to unbelievers, so that those mentioned first here are those possessed of the first gift mentioned in verse 8. "Prophets" are here ranked second, as in Eph. iv. 11, though above (vv. 8-10) prophecy was named only in the sixth place. We may take it that the order of dignity is followed here in regard to the first three, seeing that the Apostle writes: "*first* apostles, *second* prophets, *third* teachers." Doctors or teachers are perhaps those endowed with the "word of knowledge" (v. 8). The next two gifts have been already mentioned, though in inverse order, in vv. 9-10. The Apostle seems to abandon, after the first three, the classification according to rank, and turning from the concrete to the abstract he mentions the gifts instead of those who possessed them.

"Helps" (ἀντιλήμψεις) is probably to be understood, with St. Chrysostom, of a gift specially fitting some to look after the sick and poor. "Governments" refers to a gift fitting its possessor for some position of authority in the church (cf. Rom. xii. 8; 1 Thess. v. 12; Heb. xiii. 7, 17, 24). Were not the question here of *extraordinary* gifts, we might think that it referred to bishops and priests. The gift of tongues is again mentioned last, in order to warn the Corinthians against attaching too much importance to it, as apparently they had been doing (cf. xiv. 1 ff.).

29-30. The gifts, then, are various, and, as the present verses show, some had got one and some another; from which it is clear that there must be various members in the mystical body of Christ, and there is no room for pride or contempt in those who have got the higher gifts, nor for discontent and envy in those who have only the lower. God distributed the gifts, as the members in the human body, according to His will (vv. 11, 18, 28). "Do all interpret?" is undoubtedly to be read here in the end of v. 30, but this does not settle the question as to the genuineness of the corresponding clause in the end of v. 28, for if the Apostle

curationum ? numquid omnes
linguis loquuntur ? numquid
omnes interpretantur ? ³¹ Ac-
mulamini autem charismata
meliora. Et adhuc excellenti-
orem viam vobis demonstro.

of healing ? Do all speak with
tongues ? Do all interpret ?
³¹ But be zealous for the better
gifts. And I shew unto you
yet a more excellent way.

did not write that clause, it might be interpolated there on account of the present one.

31. It is doubtful whether τὰ κρείττονα ("the better") or τὰ μέζονα ("the greater") is the original. The first clause is not interrogative, but hortative (cf. xiv. 1, 39 for similar clauses); he exhorts them to appreciate the gifts that were really superior, not those that were most showy. The original meaning of ζηλοῦν is "to feel intense eagerness about a thing or person"; from this came its various senses of love, jealousy, etc. It is not clear whether the exhortation is to a desire for the better gifts, which some not endowed with them might yet hope to obtain (xiv. 13), or to an appreciation of and zeal for the better gifts on the part of all. Rather the latter. With the words: "and I show unto you," etc., a transition is effected from the subject of extraordinary gifts to that of charity, with which the next chapter deals. It is as if he said: there is, besides, something far above these gifts, something which you must prize beyond them all. Ἐτι is probably to be connected not with καί ("and moreover"), but with what follows, and καθ' ὑπερβολήν is to be taken adjectivally: "and I show unto you a yet more excellent way." Conybeare and Howson, *The Life and Epistles of St. Paul*, object to taking καθ' ὑπερβ. adjectivally here, and paraphrase: and moreover, beyond them all (καθ' ὑπερβ.), I will show you a path wherein to walk. "Loquitur autem Apostolus de charitate, quam viam vocat, hoc est, modum ac rationem vivendi. Nam via pro genere vite frequens est in Scripturis, maxime in Act. Apost." (Est.).

CHAPTER XIII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Apostle in the first place declares the necessity of charity, and the uselessness of charisms for their possessor without it (vv. xii. 31-xiii. 3); next he shows its excellence, pointing out positively and negatively its glorious fruits (4-7); and lastly he insists upon its eternal durability. Charisms shall cease in the glorious perfection of the life to come, even faith shall give place to the vision of God, but charity shall never fall away or be superseded (8-13).

¹ Si linguis hominum, loquar, et angelorum, caritatem autem non habeam, factus sum velut	¹ If I speak with the tongues of men, and of angels, and have not charity, I am become as
---	--

As has been pointed out above, the chapter falls into three divisions: (1) the necessity of charity; (2) its glorious qualities; (3) its eternal durability. The theological virtue of charity is meant, embracing both God and our neighbour, for, as St. Augustine (*De Trin.* viii. 8) says: "*ex una eademque caritate Deum proximumque diligimus, sed Deum propter Deum, nos autem et proximum propter Deum.*" Without it, all gifts are declared to be of no avail, i.e., for salvation; as St. Thomas says: "*nihil prosunt, quantum ad meritum vite æternæ.*" This charity is either identical with sanctifying grace or inseparably connected with it, and we speak of those possessing it as being in the state of grace.

1. The gift of tongues so esteemed by the Corinthians (xiv) is taken first. The sense is: if I should have the gift of tongues in the highest possible degree and should not have charity, it avails me nothing unto salvation. Angels, being spirits, do not speak in tongues, but they can communicate their thoughts, and hence the meaning seems to be: if I should be able to speak in the tongues of all men, nay, to communicate my thoughts as do the angels, etc. The "sounding brass" may be merely a fragment of brass, or perhaps a brass instrument; the "cymbal" (often mentioned in LXX, but always in the plural) was a hollow basin-like instrument, from which sound was usually produced by

æs sonans, aut cymbalum tinniens. ² Et si habuero prophetiam, et noverim mysteria omnia, et omnem scientiam : et si habuero omnem fidem ita ut montes transferam, caritatem autem non habuero, nihil sum. ³ Et si distribuero in cibos pauperum omnes facultates meas, et si tradidero

sounding brass or a tinkling cymbal. ² And if I should have prophecy, and should know all mysteries, and all knowledge, and if I should have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing. ³ And if I should distribute all my goods to feed the poor, and if I should deliver

striking two of them together. "Clanging" would be better than "tinkling." The Apostle means that the gift of tongues without charity (though it might profit others) would profit himself nothing. In the original there is no particle of comparison, such as the Vulg. "velut" or our "as," so that what the Apostle says is : "I am become a sounding brass," etc., and this is more vivid and forcible.

2. Four gifts are referred to in this verse : prophecy, wisdom, knowledge, wonder-working faith (see above on xii. 8-10) ; and it is supposed that they may be possessed without charity. "So that I could remove mountains," is probably an allusion to our Lord's words (Matt. xxi. 21 ; Mark xi. 23).

3. And if in the exercise of the gift of "helps" (ἐντιλήμεις xii. 28) I should distribute (once for all ; aor.) all my goods to feed the poor, etc. There is nothing in the Greek to represent "the poor," for the Greek verb merely means *to dole out food*, but no doubt the true sense is given by the supplement.—"And if I should deliver my body to be burned." This is probably contemplated as an exercise of the same charism of "helps" or of some other similar gift, as of "mercy" (ὁ θεῶν, Rom. xii. 8), and the sense is that if in the exercise of the charism of "mercy" he should give his life for another from some natural motive, yet if he had not charity it would profit him nothing.

This explanation supposes the true reading to be ἵνα καυθήσωμαι or καυθίσωμαι "that I may be burned" (C D E F G K L, Latt., Syrr., Arm., Aeth., Goth., Bas., Tert.) ; but there is another reading supported by B Ξ A and St. Jer. : ἵνα καυχῆσωμαι ("that I may glory") which introduces the new idea of a vain-glorious motive. Westc.-Hort give only the latter reading ; but in our opinion, notwithstanding that it has the very strong support of B Ξ A, it is not probable, for the Apostle was not likely to speak of giving his body without adding for what it was given, since,

corpus meum ita ut ardeam, caritatem autem non habuero, nihil mihi prodest.

* Caritas patiens est, benigna est : caritas non aemulatur, non agit perperam, non inflatur,

my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.

* Charity is patient, is kind : charity envieth not, dealeth not perversely : is not puffed up,

as Estius points out, some give up their bodies for unworthy purposes ; and, moreover, the introduction here of a bad motive, as of glorying, destroys the point of the passage, which consists in the fact that the *most excellent* exercise of the charisms is unavailing for their possessor without charity. If a man distributed his goods or delivered up his body *from a bad motive*, it would profit him nothing even if he had charity, and so if *ἐν καυχῇ* were the correct reading, the words " and have not charity " would be quite unnecessary and out of place.

There is probably no question in the verse of martyrdom, that is, of death endured for the Christian faith or some Christian virtue, though many commentators have held that there is. But all who hold this, are hard pressed to explain how the Apostle can suppose a case of martyrdom without charity. Some reply that he merely makes an impossible case ; others that he speaks only of material, not formal, martyrdom, and takes it for granted that the sufferer in the case suffers from some unworthy motive, as of vain glory. But surely there was no need to drag in such a case here, for such a man's action would be bad, and to say that it would profit him nothing without charity was quite unnecessary. But it was to the point to say that the most arduous work done from a good natural motive, but without charity, would avail nothing unto salvation.

We agree with Cornely, then, that there is not question of martyrdom, but of death endured from some good natural motive, as, for instance, love of friends or country.

4. Having shown how unavailing unto salvation charisms are for their possessor unless he have also charity, the Apostle now proceeds to point out the excellence of charity itself. Fifteen characteristics are mentioned (vv. 4-7), first two positive ones, then eight negative, then five more positive. All bear upon charity towards the neighbour, probably because that implies also charity towards God, and because the Corinthians and we could with less danger of deception apply the tests of charity towards the neighbour.

⁶ Non est ambitiosa, non quaerit quae sua sunt, non irritatur, non cogitat malum, ⁶ Non gaudet super iniquitate, congaudet autem veritati : ⁷ Omnia suffert, omnia credit, omnia sperat, omnia sustinet.

⁶ Is not ambitious, seeketh not her own, is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil. ⁶ Rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth with the truth : ⁷ Beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things.

"Charity is patient" or "long-suffering," i.e., endures evils without anger or impatience ; "is kind" (χρησταίεται), i.e., delights in acts of kindness towards the neighbour. "Charity envieth not" ; for ζηλοί see above on xii. 31 ; it probably covers both envy and jealousy here. The next clause, which the Rhemish version renders : "dealeth not perversely," is rendered by the R.V. "vaunteth not itself," and this is probably better. The Greek Fathers differ as to the meaning of περπερεύεται here, but most probably the idea of boasting is contained in the word (cf. Corn.). "Is not puffed up" ; this excludes pride or boasting in thought, as the preceding clause probably excludes it in words.

5. "Is not ambitious" (οὐκ ἀσχημονεῖ). The sense of the original is rather, "behaveth not in an unseemly way" (cf. vii. 36).—"Seeketh not her own," i.e., her own interests. B. followed by Clem. Alex., reads "seeketh not what is not her own" (τὸ μὴ ἑαυτῆς) ; but the common reading is far more probable, as it would be bathos to say in the midst of this glorious eulogy of charity that she does not seek the good of others.—"Is not provoked to anger, thinketh no evil." The meaning of the latter clause is rather : imputeth not *the* evil (τὸ κακόν) that is done to her, but forgiveth it.

6. "Rejoiceth not in iniquity" ; rather "over iniquity" (in others), the sense apparently being that charity has no sympathy with evil.

"But rejoiceth with the truth." Truth, like Charity, is personified, and represented as rejoicing in its own triumph, charity joining in the rejoicing. It is disputed whether truth in the strict sense or moral truth, i.e., righteousness is meant ; the antithesis (δὲ) with the preceding clause is in favour of the latter.

7. "Beareth all things." The verb ὑπέτω is used only by St. Paul in the New Testament : here ; in ix. 12 ; and in 1 Thess. iii. 1, 5 ; in the other three cases it means to bear or forbear, and hence many with the Vulgate give it that sense here, though

* *Caritas numquam excidit* ; * Charity never falleth away :
sive prophetiae evacuabuntur, whether prophecies shall be
sive linguae cessabunt, sive made void, or tongues shall

it is difficult to see how it then differs from "endureth" of this same verse. Hence others prefer here the sense of *concealing*, a sense which *κρύπτω* often has in classical Greek (cf. Eur., *Phoen.*, 1214; Soph. *Phil.* 136; *Oed. Tyr.* 341; Thuc. vi. 72), and in the only passage where it occurs in the Old Testament *Ecclus.* viii. 17. In this view charity is here said to conceal and cloak, as far as possible, the vices and weaknesses of the neighbour.

Some take the next three clauses, "believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things" of our relation to God, understanding that charity makes us ready to believe all that God has revealed, to hope for all that He has promised, and to endure patiently until His promises are fulfilled. But the Greeks commonly understand the reference still to be to the relation to the neighbour, in the sense that charity believes everything good about him or everything stated by him, as far as prudence permits; hopes for the best for him even when the evidence is discouraging; and endures with patient fortitude whatsoever evils men may inflict (cf. 2 Tim. ii. 10).

"*Illud extremo loco notandum, charitatem omnia credere, sperare, sustinere actu imperato, ut loquuntur Theologi. Nam actu elicitō charitas diligit, fides credit, et caetera. Vel certe haec omnia in personam hominis charitatem habentis accipienda sunt, qui per charitatem haec omnia facit*" (Est.).

8. From the necessity (vv. 1-3) and general excellence (vv. 4-7) of charity, the Apostle passes on to point out its crowning glory, its eternal durability. This verse may be rendered: "charity never falleth away (the sense is the same whether we read *πῖστις* or, less probably, *ἀπῖστις*), but whether (there be) prophecies, they shall be done away; whether (there be) tongues, they shall cease; whether (there be) knowledge, it shall be done away." Charity shall survive in the next life, while charisms, of which three prominent examples are taken, shall not. *καταργεῖν* is used twenty-seven times by St. Paul, and always in the sense of complete destruction or cessation. Of course, there is no foundation in this verse for the heresy of the Reformers that grace and charity once acquired cannot be lost. As the following verses show, the Apostle is speaking of what shall endure or have ceased in the *life to come*; and he who chastised his body and brought

scientia destructur. * Ex parte enim cognoscimus, et ex parte prophetamus. ¹⁰ Cum autem venerit quod perfectum est, evacuabitur quod ex parte est. ¹¹ Cum essem parvulus, loquebar ut parvulus, sapiebam ut parvulus, cogitabam ut parvulus. Quando autem factus sum vir, evacuavi quae erant parvuli. ¹² Videmus nunc per

cease, or knowledge shall be destroyed. * For we know in part, and we prophesy in part. ¹⁰ But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. ¹¹ When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood as a child, I thought as a child. But when I became a man, I put away the things of a child. ¹² We see now through a glass

it into subjection, lest perchance when he had preached to others, he himself should become a castaway (ix. 37) cannot have believed in the inamissibility of grace. Cf. Council of Trent, Sess. vi, Cap. xv. and Can. xxvii.

9. Ἐκ μέρους seems to mean here "imperfectly," for it is contrasted in the next verse with τέλειον, "perfect," "full-grown"; but the sense would hardly be changed if we took ἐκ μέρους to mean "partially," and τέλειον in the sense of "complete." The Apostle is speaking of charismatic knowledge; but the same could be said of all earthly knowledge. "Scimus" would be better than "cognoscimus" of Vulgate, as the latter rather suggests knowledge acquired in the ordinary way than that possessed through the charism.

10. The cessation of the charisms is concluded from their imperfection. No doubt charity, too, shall be more perfect in heaven, but it will be perfected without being specifically changed, the goodness of God supernaturally known being its *formal object* then as now, whereas knowledge shall be specifically changed, becoming immediate and clear in the light of the beatific vision.

11. As an illustration of the imperfect ceasing when the perfect comes, he instances the imperfections of childhood giving place to the perfections of manhood. Νήπιος (νη an inseparable syllable implying negation, and ἵπος, "speech") denotes properly a child not yet able to speak (infans). "When I was a child, I spoke as a child, I understood (R. V. 'I felt') as a child—possibly the reference is to the forming of concepts—I thought (or reasoned) as a child; but (ἔτι is very doubtful) when I am become (read γέγονα) a man, I have put away the things of the child."

12. Read "for we see" (βλέπομεν γάρ B X A K L P, Copt.);

speculum in aenigmate : tunc in a dark manner : but then face
autem facie ad faciem. Nunc to face. Now I know in part ;
cognosco ex parte : tunc autem
cognosciam sicut et cognitus but then I shall know even

what he is about to say supports the illustration of v. 11, since as childhood to manhood, so is earth to heaven, only much more so. Instead of " through a glass," we would render : " by means of a mirror." For ἑσπεριον in the sense of mirror, see James i. 23, the only other place where the word occurs in the New Testament ; also in LXX. Wisd. vii. 26 ; Eccles. xii. 11. Διά is to be taken instrumentally : " by means of a mirror," for if the Apostle had merely meant seeing in a mirror he would probably have used ἐν, as St. James does. Some, however, think that διὰ is used owing to the illusion that what is seen in a mirror appears to be behind it, and so seen *through* it. So apparently Beelen (*Gramm.*, p. 140). In St. Paul's time mirrors were made of polished steel or brass, and the best of them would give only an imperfect reflection. Perhaps, however, it is the *mediate* character of our knowledge of God and supernatural things rather than its obscurity that is alluded to in δι' ἑσπεριον.

Far less probable is the view of those who hold that the Apostle alludes to seeing through a window of semi-transparent stone or horn (" per corneum specular," Tert.), for such a window would be called διωρυκα not ἑσπεριον. See Smith, *Dict. Ant.*, i, p. 686.

" In a dark manner " (ἐν αἰνιγματι). Revised Version, " darkly," with marginal alternative : " in a riddle." If the preceding words refer chiefly to the *mediate* character of our present knowledge of Divine things, there is no doubt that these refer to its *obscurity*. The Apostle probably has in mind Num. xii. 6-8, where the Lord declares that He will speak to Moses mouth to mouth, and plainly, and not in dark speeches (οὐ δι' αἰνιγμάτων).

" But then face to face." Our knowledge of Divine things here on earth is *mediate* and *obscure* ; we obtain it through creation (Rom. i. 19-20) and revelation, and even thus only imperfectly ; but face to face with God, in the light of the beatific vision it shall be *immediate* and *clear*. The Apostle had been speaking of *charismatic* knowledge (vv. 8-9), but in βλέψομεν γάρ he is rightly held by commentators generally to include all our present knowledge of Divine things.

" Now I know (' acquire knowledge ') in part," i.e., imperfectly ;

sum. ¹³ Nunc autem manent, as I am known. ¹³ And now
fides, spes, caritas, tria hæc : there remain faith, hope,
maior autem horum est caritas. charity, these three : but the
greater of these is charity.

" then I shall know *fully* " (the compound verb can hardly be used here for any other reason than to intensify the meaning) " even as I was known fully " (in the one eternal act of God's knowledge, or, less probably, during my life on earth). The aorist ἐπεγνώστην seems to require the meaning here given to it. The perfection of knowledge of the saints in heaven is thrown into bold relief by the comparison with the Divine knowledge. It is not meant, of course, that it will be as extensive as God's knowledge, for of this finite creatures are incapable, but that it will be as immediate and as perfect in its kind. " Sine ullo medio offuscante seu diminuente notitiam, immo eodem medio ; nam cognoscam Deum in ipsa Deitate ut medio, quemadmodum ego cognitus sum in ipsa eadem Deitate " (Caj.).

13. Protestant commentators commonly hold that the Apostle teaches here that faith, hope, and charity, unlike the charisms, shall last for ever in the life to come. So also Irenæus, *C. hæc.* ii. 28, 3 ; Tert., *De pat.* 12. But such cannot be the sense, for the Apostle makes it clear elsewhere that faith shall then give place to vision (v. 12 ; 2 Cor. v. 7 ; cf. Heb. xi. 1) and hope to fruition (Rom. viii. 24). Hence Benedict XII. in the Const. *Benedictus Deus* (1336 A.D.) defined : " Visio hujusmodi divinæ essentiae ejusque fruitio *actus fidei et spei in eis* (those beholding the Divine essence) *evacuant*, prout fides et spes propriæ theologicæ sunt virtutes " (Denz., *Enchir.* ed. 11, § 530). The Apostle has already declared that charity is eternal (v. 8), and signified that faith must cease when we see God face to face (v. 12), and here he says that (though faith shall not endure in the life to come), yet faith, hope, and charity remain as *permanent endowments of the Church on earth*. There seems to be an emphasis on " remain," probably to contrast the theological virtues with the charisms, which were hardly ever permanent endowments and have largely disappeared in the Church of later times.

It is disputed whether νῦν is temporal = " in this life," or logical = " as it is," " as God has arranged." Cornely argues for the temporal sense, but as ἄρτι has been used for the temporal " now " in v. 12, and still more as νῦν ἔστι found in a logical sense shortly before and after the present verse (xii. 18 ; xiv. 6), we

prefer to take it in the same sense here. Note *μία* in the singular, the theological virtues being regarded as a triplet standing apart (Cf. J. H. Moulton, *Gr. i.*, p. 58).

“But the greater of these is charity.” “And out of these (partitive genitive) Love is greater.” Mentally, perhaps, the Apostle puts Love, about which he has said so much, into one class, and the other two virtues into another. But, however we explain the comparative (cf. Matt. xxiii. 11, and the simplest explanation is that *μῆϊστος* had become almost obsolete (J. H. Moulton, *Gr. i.*, p. 78), there is no doubt about the meaning; “Love is superior to the other two” (Rob.-Plumm.).

CHAPTER XIV

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

After a final word exhorting to charity, the Apostle proceeds to compare the gift of Prophecy with that of Tongues. First he points out that Prophecy is better calculated to profit the faithful (vv. 1-6), then by illustrations he shows that the gift of Tongues by itself is of very little use (7-12), and, unless there be someone to interpret, employed to no purpose in a religious assembly (13-20). Next he shows that even for unbelievers, for whose benefit it was chiefly intended, the gift of Tongues was inferior to that of Prophecy (21-25). Finally, he concludes with some practical regulations intended to control the public use of these charisms in the assemblies of the faithful (26-40).

After his glorious eulogy of charity, the Apostle now returns to the subject of charisms; and since the Corinthians seem to have prized too highly the gift of tongues, he pointedly institutes a comparison between it and the gift of prophecy, showing that prophecy is far superior. Before we proceed farther, it is necessary to say a few words here about these two charisms.

The *gift of Tongues* is referred to in the following passages of the New Testament: Mark xvi. 17; Acts ii. 4 ff.; x. 46; xix. 6, and in 1 Cor. xii.-xiv. Various views have been held as to its nature. Some think that those endowed with it spoke the language of our first parents; others that they spoke a new language never heard till then; others that they uttered sounds different from all human languages; others, again, that they spoke in existing foreign tongues which they had never learned. The last view seems the most probable. That there is not question merely of any *one* language, we are convinced, for in that case how could we explain the various Scriptural references: "new tongues" (Mark xvi. 17), "alien (ἑτεροῦς) tongues" (Acts ii. 4), "kinds of tongues" (xii. 10), "he who speaks in tongues" (xiv. 5)? Plainly there is question of more than one language, even, as the last reference shows, in the case of a single individual. Nor is there any good reason for holding that the languages were altogether new. If St. Mark (xvi. 17) represents our Lord as

predicting that the disciples should speak in new tongues (γλῶσσαις καινῇς *), this may fairly be taken to mean that they should speak not in languages absolutely new, but in languages till then unused by them. The strict sense of καινός requires no more than this. In our view it is easy to understand what took place on the first Pentecost; the Apostles spoke, one in one foreign language, another in another, and of course were readily understood by those to whom the particular languages were native (Acts ii. 8, 11) while to those not acquainted with the language heard they appeared to be drunk (Acts ii. 13). But had they spoken in an absolutely new language or languages, and yet been understood by their hearers, the miracle would have been as much in the hearers as in the speakers.

From the present chapter it seems clear that in Corinth, at any rate, those who possessed the gift of tongues were often unable to understand or interpret what they spoke (vv. 5, 28); from which we may conclude that the gift was not given for the purpose of enabling its possessor to teach. Evidently, either of itself or through its accompanying graces, it stimulated his spirit and enabled him to pray to God (vv. 2, 4, 14, 17), but it in no way helped the listeners, unless there was someone present who could interpret (vv. 2, 12, 13, 17). It was also meant to excite the curiosity of unbelievers (v. 22), and so stimulate their interest in the Christian religion; in which connection we may remark that such interest was much more likely to be aroused if the speakers spoke in foreign tongues which they had never learned, and which some of those present sometimes understood than if they spoke in languages absolutely unknown till then. In the latter case, how could any unbeliever be sure that they were speaking anything more than meaningless gibberish? (cf. Corn., pp. 411-414; Hasting's D. B., art. *Tongues*).

The *gift of Prophecy* in the New Testament is not merely or principally the gift of foretelling future things, though it sometimes included this (Acts xi. 27; xxi. 4, 9-11), but a gift endowing its possessor with special powers to edify, exhort, and comfort the faithful (xiv. 3). Neither St. Paul, nor the *Didache* (x. 11, 13), nor *Hermas* (*Shepherd*, Mand. 11) makes any reference to prediction of the future as the function of the prophets, from which we may confidently conclude that it was not the most important part of the prophets' gift. If they were sometimes enabled to

* *Kainos* is wanting in some early authorities.

¹ SECTAMINI caritatem, aemulamini spiritalia: magis autem ut prophetetis. ² Qui enim loquitur lingua, non hominibus loquitur, sed Deo: nemo enim audit. Spiritu

¹ FOLLOW after charity, be zealous for spiritual gifts: but rather that you may prophesy. ² For he that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God: for no man heareth. Yet by the Spirit he

foretell the future or reveal secrets, this was in order that their words might have more weight when by prayer or discourse they sought to edify, exhort, and comfort (Cf. Corn., pp. 414 f.).

1. Before turning away from charity to return to the charisms, the Apostle once more exalts it by saying: "pursue charity" (cf. Rom. ix. 30, 31; xiv. 19; 1 Thess. v. 15). Perhaps the expression implies that we can never on earth possess charity in its perfection, that the love of our neighbour and of God is a debt we can never pay fully; as St. Paul says elsewhere: "Owe no man anything, but to love one another" (Rom. xiii. 8). But this pursuit of charity must not lead them to despise the charisms; hence he adds: "yet desire earnestly (ζηλοῦτε δέ) the spiritual gifts; but rather that you may prophesy." It appears from this that though in what follows prophecy is preferred only to tongues, yet the Apostle wishes the Corinthian Christians to desire it more than any of the other charisms. This is intelligible even though apostles were superior to prophets (xii. 28), since the duty of the charismatic apostles was to preach to unbelievers, and of such preachers the Corinthians, who were already believers, had no need. On ἵνα here Stanley remarks: "ἵνα is here passing into the Romaic sense, in which it is used as a substitute for the infinitive"; and Rob.-Plumm.: "the ἵνα is definitive, not telic."

2. If our view of the gift of tongues is correct, the Apostle is here representing what would ordinarily happen at Corinth when some other language than Greek or Latin was spoken; no one would hear *so as to understand* (Acts xx. 9 compared with Acts ix. 7) what was said; but the speaker would merely be speaking in *his* spirit (rather than the Divine Spirit; cf. v. 14), that is, with his affections stimulated, but not with understanding (v. 14), things that were hidden. Μυστήριον in the New Testament generally means truth about God, once hidden, but now revealed; here, however, it means things still hidden, chiefly by reason of the form in which they were expressed.

autem loquitur mysteria. ³ Nam qui prophetat, hominibus loquitur ad aedificationem, et exhortationem, et consolationem. ⁴ Qui loquitur lingua, semetipsum aedificat: qui autem prophetat, ecclesiam Dei aedificat. ⁵ Volo autem omnes vos loqui linguis: magis autem prophetare. Nam maior est qui prophetat, quam qui loquitur linguis: nisi forte interpretetur, ut ecclesia aedifica-

speaketh mysteries. ³ But he that prophesieth, speaketh to men unto edification and exhortation and comfort. ⁴ He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself; but he that prophesieth, edifieth the church. ⁵ And I would have you all to speak with tongues, but rather to prophesy. For greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh with tongues: unless perhaps he

Some think that the present verse proves that speaking in existing foreign languages cannot be meant. Thus Rob.-Plumm., p. 306, say here: "Verse after verse shows that speaking in foreign languages cannot be meant. Tongues were used in communing with God, and of course this was good for those who did so (v. 4). Tongues were a sort of spiritual soliloquy addressed partly to self, partly to Heaven." But see what we have just written above.

3. Read ὁ δὲ ("qui autem"). The description here given of prophecy seems to justify what has been said above about this gift in our remarks introductory to this chapter.

4. "Edifieth himself," his spiritual sense being quickened and his pious affections stimulated, "like a nun, ignorant of Latin, devoutly chanting the Breviary" (Rick.). The latter part of the verse may perhaps mean that the prophet edifies the gathering (ἐκκλησίαν) in which he speaks (v. 26). The article is wanting before ἐκκλησίαν and the Vulgate "Dei" is probably spurious, and both facts make it less likely that the universal Church is meant; though, of course, it too would be edified to some extent in the edification of a particular Christian assembly.

5. In: "but I would have you all to speak with tongues," he guards against their concluding from what he has said that he despised this gift. It is uncertain whether we ought to read μᾶλλον γάρ ("for greater") or μᾶλλον δὲ ("but greater"); even if δὲ be the true reading, it must get an explanatory force and the sense is not altered. The words: "unless he interpret," show that the gift of interpretation sometimes accompanied that of tongues in the same person. In ἐκτός ἐστι μὴ, we have a pleonastic construction, either ἐκτός or μὴ being redundant. The "perhaps"

tionem accipiat. ⁶ Nunc autem, fratres, si venero ad vos linguis loquens; quid vobis prodero, nisi vobis loquar aut in revelatione, aut in scientia, aut in prophetia, aut in doctrina?

⁷ Tamen quae sine anima sunt vocem dantia, sive tibia, sive cithara, nisi distinctionem sonituum dederint: quomodo scietur id quod canitur, aut

interpret, that the church may receive edification. ⁶ But now, brethren, if I come to you, speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you unless I speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in doctrine?

⁷ Even things without life that give sound, whether pipe or harp, except they give a distinction of sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or

of our version and "forte" of the Vulgate might be omitted as at least unnecessary.

6. To bring the matter better home to them, he now supposes the case of even himself coming to them. *NOV*(1) here is logical, equal "this being so," the gift of tongues by itself being useless for general edification. Since the latter portion of the verse: "unless I speak to you either in revelation," etc., apparently does not refer to different kinds of interpretation, but to other charisms different from both those of tongues and of their interpretation, the whole verse seems virtually to contain two questions: But now, brethren, if I come to you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you? What shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy or in teaching? It is disputed whether four charisms or only two are referred to in the last clause. The latter is the more common view among modern commentators, revelation and knowledge being regarded as the internal elements, of which prophecy and teaching are the outward manifestation.

7. The inutility of the gift of tongues without interpretation is now illustrated from musical instruments, which, unless they give forth distinguishable notes, produce noise and not music. The pipe or flute and the harp may be taken to represent all wind and stringed musical instruments. It has been argued from this verse that those who spoke in tongues emitted only confused sounds; but this does not follow, for the illustration is intelligible, if they spoke in foreign tongues while there was no one present to interpret. *Ὅμως* ("yet") is thrown out of its natural place by hyperbaton (cf. Gal. iii. 15), and the sense is: "things without life that give sound . . . yet, except they give a distinction of

quod citharizatur ? * Etenim si incertam vocem det tuba : quis parabit se ad bellum ? * Ita et vos per linguam nisi manifestum sermonem dederitis ; quomodo sciatur id quod dicitur ? eritis enim in aëra loquentes. ¹⁰ Tam multa, ut puta, genera linguarum sunt in hoc mundo : et nihil sine voce est. ¹¹ Si ergo nesciero virtutem vocis, ero ei cui loquor, barbarus ; et qui loquitur, mihi

harped ? * For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle ? * So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue plain speech, how shall it be known what is said ? For you shall be speaking into the air. ¹⁰ There are, for example, so many kinds of tongues in this world : and none is without voice. ¹¹ If then I know not the power of the voice, I shall be to him, to whom I speak, a barbarian, and he, that speaketh, a barbarian to me.

(musical) sounds," etc. (cf. Grimm. *sub voce*). The Revised Version, however, renders : "even things without life."

8. Another illustration from an instrument that gives the strongest and clearest sound ; yet even in the case of the trumpet, confusion or uncertainty in its sounds would render it useless for giving signals. In this context πόλεμον is "battle" rather than "war."

9. "Plain speech" ; "plain not merely absolutely, the language itself being correct and fraught with meaning, but relatively, it being understood by the company present. Thus the language of Socrates is not *plain speech* in the streets of London" (Rick.).

10-11. Another illustration, drawn from ordinary experience in regard to foreign languages. Most probably γένη φωνῶν means "kinds of languages," as the Vulgate understands it, and the Apostle might have written instead γένη γλωσσῶν only that he had already used this in a technical sense in reference to the gift of tongues (xii. 10). The sense, then, seems to be : There are, for example, so many kinds of languages in the world, and none of them lacks the power of language (ἄφωνον—"nulla lingua est, quae linguae vim non habeat" (Grimm). "If then I know not the meaning (δύναμιν) of the language, I shall be to him that speaketh (τῷ λαλοῦντι) a barbarian, and he that speaketh a barbarian to me." Εἰ τύχοι (v. 10) is taken by some as equivalent to "perhaps" or "it may be" (Revised Version) in the sense of indifference or even uncertainty as to the exact number ; but "for example" or "for instance" (Vulgate, "ut puta") suits

barbarus. ¹² Sic et vos, quoniam aemulatores estis spirituum, ad aedificationem ecclesiae quaerite ut abundetis. ¹³ Et ideo qui loquitur lingua, oret ut interpretetur. ¹⁴ Nam si orem lingua, spiritus meus orat, mens autem mea sine

¹² So you also, forasmuch as you are zealous of spirits, seek to abound unto the edifying of the church. ¹³ And therefore he that speaketh by a tongue, let him pray that he may interpret. ¹⁴ For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth but

the context here, and especially in xv. 37. Βάρβαρος, like our "gibberish" or "bow-wow," is onomatopœic.

12. Some would put a full stop after : "so also you," taking the sense to be : so also you shall seem barbarians if you speak in tongues and there be no one to interpret. But since in that case we should naturally expect some concluding particle in the next clause : since *therefore* you are zealous, etc., and as v. 12 is a conclusion parallel to that in v. 9, where "so also you" does not stand by itself, perhaps we may take the present verse as meaning : Wherefore do you also (as I do), since you are zealous for spirits (spiritual gifts), seek to abound unto the edifying of the Church.

13. "Wherefore" (ὥς, i.e., since they ought to seek to abound unto the edifying of the Church, let him who speaks in a tongue pray for the gift of interpretation. There is no doubt that this is the sense, though some, led by the fact that "pray" is used in the next verse of charismatic prayer, have taken the sense to be : Wherefore let him that speaketh in a tongue, *pray in a tongue* with the intention of interpreting immediately afterwards. But against this is the fact that one who spoke in a tongue did not always (v. 27) and could not always (v. 28) interpret. Besides, as Rob.-Plumm. remark : "it does not follow that, because we have προσεύχωμαι γλώσση in v. 14, therefore γλώσση is to be understood with προσευχίσθω in v. 13." The present verse, then, shows that one who spoke in a tongue might not have the gift of interpretation, but implies that he might sometimes obtain it through prayer. "Et" before "ideo" in Vulgate is to be omitted.

14. He proceeds to support by reasons (γάρ) the exhortations of vv. 12, 13. "Spirit" (πνεῦμα) seems to refer here to the will and affections ; "understanding" (νοῦς) to the intellect. It is not quite clear whether "without fruit" means without fruit to the speaker or to his hearers. The former seems more probable

fructu est. ¹⁵ Quid ergo est ?
 Orabo spiritu, orabo et mente :
 psallam spiritu, psallam et
 mente. ¹⁶ Ceterum si bene-
 dixeris spiritu, qui supplet
 locum idiotae, quomodo dicet,

my understanding is without
 fruit. ¹⁵ What is it then ? I
 will pray with the spirit, I will
 pray also with the understand-
 ing : I will sing with the spirit,
 I will sing also with the under-
 standing. ¹⁶ Else if thou shalt
 bless with the spirit, how shall
 he that holdeth the place of

(cf. Matt. xiii. 22 ; Mark iv. 19), for the Apostle seems to be urging in this verse the inferiority of the gift of tongues for the speaker himself, and in vv. 16-17 its inferiority in references to others. The view of à Lapide, followed by MacEvilly and others, that " my understanding " means the understanding of me by others, even if it be a possible meaning of ὁ θεὸς μου, is quite improbable on account of the antithesis between " my understanding " and " my spirit."

15. " What is it then," i.e., what then are we to conclude ? The substance of his answer is that they ought to endeavour to understand what they speak, either by getting others to interpret or by obtaining for themselves through prayer the gift of interpretation. It is to be noted in connection with this and similar verses, that there is no question here of liturgical prayers offered in the name of the Church. For wise reasons : uniformity of worship in a world-wide Church, greater reverence, etc., Latin, though a dead language, is retained by the Church in her liturgy ; it must, however, be remembered that the faithful are supplied with vernacular translations of the Mass, and nuns ignorant of Latin with translations of the office they chant, so that in fact an interpretation is present (Cf. Perrone, *Prael. theolog.*, *De Euchar. prout est Sacrif.*, c. iv ; Trent, Sess. xxii, *De Sacrif. Missae*, cap. viii).

16. ἄσῳτῆς, which our version renders " unlearned," is common in classical Greek in the sense of a private person as opposed to one holding public office, also of one ignorant of an art as opposed to one having technical knowledge (Cf. Lidd. and Scott). Grimm gives the meaning : "*homo privatus* oppositus magistratibus, principibus, regibus ; sed sunt etiam multae aliae nominis notiones, quarum e suo quaeque antitheto intelligitur," etc. It seems to refer here to all who filled the rôle of listeners, as opposed to the person speaking in a tongue who held for the time being a quasi-

Amen, super tuam benedic- tionem ? quoniam quid dicas, nescit : 17 Nam tu quidem bene gratias agis : sed alter non	the unlearned say, Amen, to thy blessing ? because he know- eth not what thou sayest. 17 For thou indeed givest thanks well, but the other is not edified.
---	--

official position. But granting this, there is still room for doubt as to what the Apostle means by "he who *fills the place* of the ἰδιώτης." Is this merely a circumlocution for "the listener" or "the audience," or does it refer, as Estius holds, to one who *represented* the listeners, who supplied their place, in giving responses ? The phrase itself, as well as the sense of ἀναπληροῦν in xvi. 17 ("supplied in your stead what was wanting on your part"), and the Vulgate "supplet" (not implet) are in favour of the latter view. According to this, then, the sense of the verse will be : Else if thou shalt bless with the spirit (i.e., pray or chant praises to God in a tongue, v. 14), how shall he that *represents* the listeners for the purpose of giving responses, say the Amen to thy thanksgiving, seeing he knoweth not what thou sayest ? The Greek words rendered by our version "bless" and "blessing," are εὐλογῆσθαι and εὐχαριστεῖν. There is no reason to believe that they have any reference here to the blessing or thanksgiving in connection with the Blessed Eucharist ; the minister there would not speak in a tongue. They seem to be used here as practically synonymous, as well they might be, seeing that God is often blessed and praised in being thanked for His favours ; but this does not prove that the two words do not refer to different actions of our Lord in the Scriptural accounts of the institution of the Blessed Eucharist (See above on xi. 24).

"Amen" is a Hebrew word which has been taken over unchanged into other languages (cf. Deut. xxvii. 15 ; Ps. cv. 48, etc.). At the beginning of a sentence, it means *truly* ; at the end, it approves what has been said or prays that it may come to pass. It was in use in the synagogues long before the time of Christ, and was taken over at once into the Christian worship (Just. M., *Apol.* i, 65 ; Tert., *De Spectac.* 25). St. Jerome says that at Rome the Amen resounded like thunder : "Ubi sic ad similitudinem coelestis tonitruī Amen reboat" (Pref. to Comment. on Ep. to Galatians).

17. "The other" (ὁ ἕτερος) is "the neighbour," as above in x. 24, and in Rom. xiii. 8.

aedificatur. ¹⁸ Gratias ago Deo meo, quod omnium vestrum lingua loquor. ¹⁹ Sed in ecclesia volo quinque verba sensu meo loqui, ut et alios instruam : quam decem millia verborum in lingua. ²⁰ Fratres, nolite pueri effici sensibus, sed malitia parvuli estote : sensibus autem perfecti estote.

²¹ In lege scriptum est : Quoniam in aliis linguis et labiis aliis loquar populo huic : et nec sic exaudient me, dicit Do-

¹⁸ I thank my God I speak with all your tongues. ¹⁹ But in the church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also, than ten thousand words in a tongue. ²⁰ Brethren, do not become children in sense, but in malice be children, and in sense be perfect.

²¹ In the law it is written : *In other tongues and other lips, I will speak to this people : and neither so will they hear Me,*

18. Neither the Vulgate nor our Version seems to give the sense of the original here. We ought to render : " I thank God, I speak (αὐλῶ, not λαλῶν) in a tongue more than you all " (" quod omnibus vobis magis lingua loquar "). Though he has preferred the gift of prophecy to that of tongues, he shows them here that he does not despise the latter.

19. But, though he possessed the gift in such a high degree, he tells them that (whatever he might do in private) in an assembly of the faithful he would rather speak five (i.e., a few) words with his understanding (so as to know what he spoke and thus be able to instruct others), than ten thousand words in a tongue.

20. Addressing them by the endearing title of " brothers," he now tells them to be as infants in malice, but in mind to *become* full-grown men (τέλειοι). The implication is that they were not acting as men in preferring, as children might, the showy gift of tongues to others more useful. The verse fitly winds up what he has said about the inferiority of the gift of tongues to prophecy for believers, while it serves as an introduction to what he is now about to say (vv. 21-25) of the relation of the two charisms to unbelievers.

21. The substance of what he now tells them (vv. 21-25) is that the gift of tongues is meant as a sign for unbelievers, yet even under this aspect it is inferior to prophecy.

" The Law " generally refers only to the Pentateuch ; but here, as occasionally (Rom. iii. 19 ; John x. 24 ; xii. 34, etc.), it means the entire Old Testament, the reference being to Isaias xxviii. 11. The prophet there (v. 7 ff.) threatens the kingdom of

minus. ²² Itaque lingue in *saith the Lord.* ²³ Wherefore
 signum sunt non fidelibus, sed tongues are for a sign, not to
 infidelibus : prophetiae autem believers, but to unbelievers :
 non infidelibus, sed fidelibus. but prophecies, not to un-
²² Si ergo conveniat universa believers, but to believers. ²³ If

Juda that because they mocked his repeated warnings and commands, "God shall speak to them by men of strange lips and with another tongue" (the Assyrian conquerors are meant, whose language, though of the same family as Hebrew, would be unintelligible to the Jews), yet even thus they shall not repent, but shall "fall backward and be broken, and snared, and taken" (v. 13). St. Paul in his quotation departs widely from the LXX (Origen, *Philocalia* ix, 2, says that he follows Aquila's version); but gives the sense of the Hebrew text while altering somewhat the form. The important words that conclude the quotation here: "and not even thus will they hear Me, saith the Lord," are not found at all in the original, at least as we have it now; but are the Apostle's summing up of what the context, especially v. 13, implies. There is, of course, no difficulty in the fact that St. Paul attributes to God as the speaker the words of God's inspired prophet.

22. What the strange-tongued Assyrian conquerors were to the unbelieving Jews of old, those endowed with the gift of tongues were to unbelievers in the beginning of the Christian period; in both cases the strange tongues were for a sign to unbelievers. The Apostle seems to regard the passage of *Isaias* as referring in its mystical sense to the early Christian period, and hence concludes from it: "Wherefore the tongues are for a sign," etc. They were in both cases a sign of God's indignation, those for whom they were intended having proved themselves unworthy of plain speech. This need not prevent us, however, from admitting that God meant them also as a sign of His presence and power, with the hope of arousing the attention and so conducing to the conversion of the unbelievers. To the faithful they were not meant as a sign, nor was it on their account that the gift of tongues was bestowed; yet, as we have seen (v. 4), they sometimes benefited by it. The words: "but prophecy (singular) is not to unbelievers, but to believers," are not a conclusion from *Isaias*, but the Apostle's own assertion.

23. This and the next two verses show that even for unbelievers Prophecy is more useful than Tongues. By ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη is

ecclesia in unum, et omnes linguis loquantur, intrent autem idiotae, aut infideles: nonne dicent quod insanitis? ²⁴ Si autem omnes prophetent, intret autem quis infidelis, vel idiota, convincitur ab omnibus, diiudicatur ab omnibus: ²⁵ Occulta cordis eius manifesta fiunt, et ita cadens in faciem adorabit

therefore the whole church come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned persons or infidels, will they not say that you are mad? ²⁴ But if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or an unlearned person, he is convinced of all, he is judged of all. ²⁵ The secrets of his heart are made manifest, and so, falling down on his face, he will

meant the whole *local* church or assembly. He makes the case of all who had the gift of Tongues (probably they would not be a very large number in any one church) speaking *at the same time* in an assembly of the church. As they were speaking not to men but to God (v. 2), their speaking at the same time is not incredible. The Apostles on the first Pentecost seem to have spoken in tongues simultaneously (Acts ii. 7), and in v. 27 below St. Paul seems to forbid such a practice in future, so that there is no good ground for thinking that in the present verse he merely contemplates the case of all speaking in succession. It is hard to be certain who are meant by the ἱδιῶται here. They appear to be different from "the whole church" as well as from unbelievers; so that the reference must be to catechumens, who would be unlikely to have any previous experience of Tongues, or else to the faithful from other churches where the gift was unknown. There need be no difficulty about understanding ἱδιώτης here in a different sense from that attributed to it in v. 16, for the word had very different senses according to its context, as the extract from Grimm given above on v. 16 proves. This verse shows that at this time unbelievers were admitted to the assemblies of the faithful in Corinth.

24-25. Though it is less easy to imagine that all would prophesy simultaneously, yet the Apostle seems to suppose so here, and to guard against such a practice in future (v. 29). The ἱδιώτης here must belong to the same class referred to in v. 23. By the preaching of the prophets, who dilated in inspired language on sin and its consequences, the unbeliever or the catechumen "is reproved" (ἐλέγχεται) by all (the speakers), he is "inquired into" (ἀνακρίνεται) and thus moved to examine himself by all, the

Deum, pronuncians quod vere Deus in vobis sit.

²⁶ Quid ergo est, fratres? cum convenitis, unusquisque vestrum psalmum habet, doctrinam habet, apocalypsim habet, linguam habet, interpretationem habet, omnia ad aedificationem fiant. ²⁷ Sive lingua quis loquitur, secundum duos, aut ut multum tres, et per partes: et

adore God, affirming that God is among you indeed.

²⁶ How is it then, brethren? When you come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation: let all things be done to edification. ²⁷ If any speak with a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and in

secrets of his heart are thus made manifest *to himself* (i.e., his half-hidden, half-forgotten sins are made to stand out clearly before him), and so, falling down on his face, he will adore God, proclaiming that God is among you (or: "in you") indeed. On ἀμιστος ἡ ἰδιώτης (v. 24) instead of ἰδιῶται ἡ ἀμιστοί (v. 23), Rob.-Plumm. remark: "The change to the singular and the change of order have point. A good effect would be more probable in the case of an individual than of a group: and if the ἀμιστος was deeply moved by what he heard, *a fortiori* the ἰδιώτης would be. In the former case the argument is the other way: if ἰδιῶται said that they were demented, still more would ἀμιστοί do so." As we have already indicated, the conclusion to be drawn from these verses is that even for the unbeliever Prophecy was superior to Tongues.

26. The Apostle now proceeds to lay down some practical rules for the public use of the charisms. "How is it then?" or as our version renders the same clause above in v. 15: "What is it then?" i.e., what practical conclusions are we to draw from what has been said? In reply, he first sets forth the actual condition of things when they come together: how those endowed with the charisms had, one one gift, another another; then adds that the guiding principle in the use of all is to be the edification of the brethren, in other words charity.

27. Having laid down this general rule for the use of all the charisms, he now gives special directions in regard to Tongues and Prophecy, the two charisms which he has been comparing in the preceding portion of the chapter, and which apparently were most common at Corinth. "If any speak in a tongue (let it be) by two, or at the most by three," etc. The sense is that in *each* assembly (hence the distributive construction κατὰ δύο) not more than two, or at most three should speak, and these

unus interpretetur. ²⁸ Si autem non fuerit interpres, taceat in ecclesia, sibi autem loquatur, et Deo. ²⁹ Prophetæ autem duo, aut tres dicant, et ceteri diiudicent. ³⁰ Quod si alii revelatum fuerit sedenti, prior taceat. ³¹ Potestis enim omnes per singulos prophetare: ut omnes

course, and let one interpret. ²⁸ But if there be no interpreter, let him hold his peace in the church, and speak to himself and to God. ²⁹ And let the prophets speak, two or three: and let the rest judge. ³⁰ But if anything be revealed to another sitting, let the first hold his peace. ³¹ For you may all prophesy one by one; that

not together, but in their turn; and that one should always interpret.

28. This verse shows that those endowed with the charisms could abstain at will from using them (cf. vv. 19, 30, 32); hence that they were not irresponsible ecstasies. Ἐκκλησία is not to be understood of the building where the Christians were met, but of the assembly itself. See on xi. 18.

29. Two or three are to prophesy on each occasion, and of course in turn. There was now no need of interpretation, but there was room for the exercise of another charism, that of "discernment of spirits" (xii. 10). Those endowed with this gift were to judge whether the speaker was a true prophet, and whether all that he said was spoken under the impulse of the Holy Ghost. What is said in the *Didache* (xi. 7) against trying or discerning any prophet who spoke in the Spirit is not in contradiction with this, for there the prophet is supposed to be already proved to be a true prophet, and hence all questioning criticism of his words is forbidden.

30. But if a revelation be made to another sitting by, and he feel a Divine impulse to speak, let the first draw to a close. It is hardly meant that he should *immediately* be silent; this would be more fitly expressed by the aorist imper., σιγησάτω. The congregation is supposed to be sitting.

31. If one would thus stop when another received a revelation, all the prophets would be able to speak successively in the assemblies, three at each meeting; and as some members of the congregation would derive more benefit from the preaching of some than of others, the variety of inspired preachers would best consult for the needs of all the congregation. "Exhortentur" (of Vulg.) is to be taken in a passive sense, as in our Version, like the same verb in 2 Cor. i. 4.

discant, et omnes exhortentur :

³² Et spiritus prophetarum prophetis subiecti sunt. ³³ Non enim est dissensionis Deus, sed pacis : sicut et in omnibus ecclesiis sanctorum doceo.

all may learn, and all may be exhorted : ³² And the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets. ³³ For God is not the God of dissension, but of peace : as also I teach in all the churches of the saints.

32. Some understand "prophets" in the first instance to refer to those who are speaking ; in the second to those to whom they are to give way ; but if that sense were meant the Apostle would probably have written : "Prophets must be subject to *one another*." It is much more probable that the reference in both instances is to the same people : Prophets' spirits are subject to prophets. The spirit of sibylis and pythonesses were not under control, and so utterance went on till the impulse ceased ; but it was not so with the Christian prophets, and hence they *could and ought to stop* when required (v. 30). "Spirits of prophets" refers most probably not to their minds, but to their charisms.

33. Another reason why one prophet ought to give place to another. God is not a God of tumult and dissension, and the fact that He moves a second prophet to speak now to the congregation, is evidence that He means the first to stop. The clause : "as in all the churches of the saints" ("doceo" and "I teach" are to be omitted) is connected by many with what precedes : God is not the author of dissension but of peace in your church, as in all the churches of the saints. But it seems to us much more probable that the words are to be connected with what follows : "As in all the churches of the saints, let the women (ὁμῶν is very doubtful) keep silence in the assemblies." To throw into prominence the custom of the other churches, he refers to it at the beginning of the sentence. Nor is there any difficulty about supposing that the Apostle would use ἐκκλησία in two different senses here, for the meaning would be clear enough to the Corinthians, especially as he has used the word frequently in this Epistle in both senses : of local churches (i. 2 ; iv. 17 ; vii. 17 ; xi. 16 ; xiv. 23) ; of assemblies of the faithful (xi. 18 ; xiv. 4, 19, 28). On this question of the conduct of women in the Christian assemblies, the Apostle might very naturally appeal to the example of other churches, but there seems to be no reason why he should think it necessary to remind the Corinthians of the self-evident fact that God was not a God of dissension in the other churches.

³⁴ Mulieres in ecclesiis taceant, non enim permittitur eis loqui, sed subditas esse, sicut et lex dicit. ³⁵ Si quid autem volunt discere, domi viros suos interrogent. Turpe est enim mulieri loqui in ecclesia.

³⁶ An a vobis verbum Dei processit? aut in vos solos

³⁴ Let women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted them to speak, but to be subject, as also the law saith. ³⁵ But if they would learn anything, let them ask their husbands at home. For it is a shame for a woman to speak in the church.

³⁶ Or did the word of God come out from you? or came

34. If we read the infin. ὑποτάσσασθαι ("to be subject"), there is a touch of irony: "for it is not permitted them to speak, but (it is permitted them) to be subject, as also the law saith" (Gen. iii. 16). But it is doubtful whether we ought not to read the imperative ὑποτάσσάσθωσαν with B K A, Copt. Aeth.: "for it is not permitted them to speak; but let them be subject, as also the law saith." In either case the substance of what is said is that women are not permitted to address the assembled faithful. In 1 Tim. ii. 12, St. Paul forbids a woman to *teach* in the liturgical assemblies, here he orders her to keep silence, so that all preaching or prophesying as well as teaching seems to be forbidden. Hence the Apostle can hardly mean in xi. 5 that a woman might sometimes prophesy in the assemblies; he must be speaking there of all women who attended the Christian gatherings and so joined in the prayers and prophecies by a union of spirit and by answering Amen.

35. He forbids the women even to put questions in the assemblies. They are to inquire of their husbands at home in reference to anything they failed to understand. The husbands, if unable to explain, could inquire in the liturgical assembly. That he speaks directly of married women is made clear by τοὺς ἰσχυροὺς ἄνδρας, but the reason by which he enforces the precept: "for it is a shame," etc., shows that the same holds for all women. Possibly he takes it for granted that only married women would presume to ask questions in the assemblies, for in those days there were no suffragettes.

36. Was yours the *first* church, or is it the *only* one, that you should seek to be a law to yourselves? "Itaque," says Cornely, "Apostolus præceptum hoc eadem ratione terminat, qua illud inchoavit aliarum ecclesiarum antiquiorum mores ritusque junioribus imitandos et sequendos proponens. Nobis autem, uti

pervenit? ³⁷ Si quis videtur propheta esse, aut spiritualis, cognoscat quae scribo vobis, quia Domini sunt mandata.

³⁸ Si quis autem ignorat, ignorabitur. ³⁹ Itaque fratres aemula-

it only unto you? ³⁷ If any seem to be a prophet, or spiritual, let him know the things that I write to you, that they are the commandments of the Lord. ³⁸ But if any man know not, he shall not be known. ³⁹ Wherefore, brethren,

recte jam monuit S. Aug., eodem tempore ostendit, in quaestionibus, quae de doctrina et consuetudinibus in Ecclesia suscitantur, ad antiquitatem respiciendum esse, quid Apostoli, quid primi fideles, quid eorum ordine successores docuerint tradiderintque (cfr. ad xi. 16). Profecto a principio protestantico, quod non tantum singulis ecclesiis sed singulis fidelibus jus potestatemque attribuit ea faciendi et credendi, quae ipsi in codicibus suis sacris invenisse sibi videntur, Paulus longissime abfuit."

37. If anyone seems to himself, i.e., thinks (rightly or wrongly) that he has the charism of prophecy or some other charism, such a one is to know and understand (the compound verb strengthens the meaning) that what the Apostle has written has the sanction of the Lord (cf. Rom. xii. 3). Some authorities have the singular, "commandment," and others omit the word altogether. If it is to be read, as seems more probable, then the reference is to the practical directions in 26 ff.; if it were spurious, then the clause would probably mean that all he has written in the entire section (xii. 1-xiv. 36) dealing with charisms, and not merely the part giving practical directions, is from the Lord and not on his own authority. In either case, St. Paul knows that he is the mouthpiece of Christ (cf. ii. 10-16; vii. 40; 2 Cor. xiii. 3; 1 John iv. 6).

38. It is disputed whether the last word of this verse in the Greek ought to be ἀγνοῦται, i.e., "is ignored" (Vulgate, "ignorabitur") or ἀγνοῦτω, i.e., "let him be ignorant." The evidence for the two readings is about equal. In the first case the sense is: but if any man refuses to acknowledge as having the authority of Christ what I have laid down, he is not acknowledged by God; in the second case: but if any man . . . let him refuse to acknowledge it at his peril; or perhaps: let him do so—I won't dispute with him, he is not the possessor of a true charism.

39. In summing up and concluding, he affectionately addresses them as "brothers," in pleasant contrast with the severe rebuke

mini prophetare : et loqui
linguis nolite prohibere. ⁴⁰ Om-
nia autem honeste et secundum
ordinem fiant.

be zealous to prophesy : and
forbid not to speak with
tongues. ⁴⁰ But let all things
be done decently and according
to order.

of v. 36. The superiority of Prophecy to Tongues is once more shown in the fact that the one is to be earnestly desired, the exercise of the other merely not to be hindered.

40. Some think that v. 39 sums up vv. 1-25, and the present verse vv. 26-38. Others hold that the present verse is a conclusion to the entire subject of religious assemblies, which the Apostle began to treat of in xi. 2. "In these three chapters (xii.-xiv.) the Apostle has been contending with the danger of *spiritual anarchy*, which would be the result if every Christian who believed he had a charisma were allowed to exercise it without consideration for others. He passes on to the danger of one form of *philosophic scepticism*—doubt as to the possibility of resurrection" (Rob.-Plumm.).

CHAPTER XV

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

As some Corinthians who called themselves Christians were denying all bodily resurrection, the Apostle refutes them by establishing, in the first place, beyond all reasonable doubt or cavil the resurrection of Christ's body (vv. 1-20a). Next he teaches that Christ is to be followed in resurrection by all those who are His, and this, when He shall have conquered all His enemies, including death (20b-28). This authoritative teaching is then supported by some arguments (29-34). Afterwards he touches on the possibility of resurrection, and treats of the qualities of the risen body (35-44), and insists that such a spiritualised body as he contemplates is possible (44-49). Finally he declares that such a change in the animal body is necessary before it can share in the kingdom of God ; such a change, however, is, through Jesus Christ, assured to all the just, and so the Corinthian Christians ought to stand steadfast in the faith and abound in good works (50-58).

<p>¹ NOTUM autem vobis facio fratres, evangelium quod prae- dicavi vobis, quod et accepistis,</p>	<p>¹ Now I make known unto you, brethren, the gospel which I preached to you, which also</p>
--	---

Hitherto the Apostle has dealt with various abuses, and replied to a number of questions ; he now takes up, and in the last place as if for emphasis, the great dogmatic question of the resurrection of the body. It may be that the Corinthians had not referred to the subject in their letter, for he begins here differently from the way in which he begins (περὶ ὧν, κ.τ.λ.) in vii. 1 ; viii. 1 ; xii. 1 ; possibly he had learned by report that there were some Christians in Corinth who were calling in question the resurrection of the body (v. 12). Who or what they were we cannot be certain, but we may take it as likely that they were Gentile converts ; the Corinthian Church was largely Gentile (Acts xviii. 6), and we know that the doctrine of a bodily resurrection when announced by Paul had attracted the attention and derision of the Athenians (Acts xvii. 18, 32). Throughout the chapter the Apostle treats only of the resurrection of the *just*, or the glorious resurrection, but of course we are not to infer that he did not believe in the

in quo et statis. ² Per quod et salvamini : qua ratione prædicaverim vobis, si tenetis, nisi frustra credidistis. ³ Tradidi enim vobis in primis, quod et accepi : quoniam Christus mortuus est pro peccatis nostris

you have received, and wherein you stand ; ² By which also you are saved, if you hold fast after what manner I preached unto you, unless you have believed in vain. ³ For I delivered unto you first of all, which I also received : How that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures :

corporal resurrection of the unjust (cf. 2 Cor. v. 10 ; Acts xxiv. 15 ; Matt. xxv. 32, 33, 41 ; John v. 28, 29)* ; he deals with the question that was of direct importance for his Christian readers.

1. He begins by recalling to their minds " the glad tidings," the Gospel, which he had preached to them at their conversion and which they had then accepted. The context makes it clear that γινώσκω does not mean here to make known what was hitherto unknown, but it may convey a hint that some of them were forgetting what they had once learned and accepted (cf. Gal. i. 11).

2. " Are saved," i.e., are being saved. Their salvation had already begun through grace, and would be perfected in glory. He makes a condition, however : " if you are holding it fast after what manner I preached unto you." Τίτι λόγῳ probably covers the form, to some extent, as well as the substance of the Gospel ; the prominent place he had given to the doctrine of Christ's resurrection belonged to that form. The placing of τίτι λόγῳ, etc., before εἰ κοιτέτε throws the former into prominence. The R.V. connects differently : " I make known (I say,) in what words I preached it unto you, if ye hold it fast " ; but this seems improbable, for the Apostle's making it known was not conditioned by their holding it fast.—" Unless you believed in vain." It seems best to take this to mean : unless faith is useless—a *reductio ad absurdum* referred to again below in v. 14. Thus ἐκῆ = " in vain," as in our version and Revised Version (cf. Gal. iii. 4 ; iv. 11). Others take ἐκῆ as equivalent to " without consideration " " rashly."

3. " First of all," first in importance rather than time, though the latter may also be meant, for the Apostles generally began their preaching by reference to the death and resurrection of

* Cf. *Irish Theological Quarterly*, April, 1910, pp. 142-143.

secundum scripturas : ⁴ Et quia sepultus est, et quia resurrexit tertia die secundum scripturas : ⁴ And that He was buried, and that He rose again the third day according to the scriptures :
⁵ Et quia visus est Cephae, et ⁵ And that He was seen by

Christ (Acts ii. 22 ff. ; x. 4 ff. ; xiii. 29 ff. ; xvii. 18, 31). St. Paul received his knowledge of the Gospel immediately from Christ Himself ; " for neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but through revelation of Jesus Christ " (Gal. i. 12). See above on xi. 23. Note the redemptory character of Christ's death. Scripture was fulfilled both in His death and in His death for our sins (Is. liii, etc.), and the Apostle had preached this fulfilment, even as he now recalls it, to help the faith of the Corinthians.

4. As in each of the four Gospels, so here the burial is carefully mentioned, doubtless because it supplies an argument for the reality of the death and, still more, for the reality of the resurrection, inasmuch as the tomb in which the body was laid and guarded by soldiers was afterwards found empty.—" And that He rose (hath risen) again the third day " (τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ B & A D E, 17, Cyr.). In ἐγήγερται we have a change from the aorists used of what took place once for all to the perfect denoting a result which abides ; He remains alive as the Risen One. Here and wherever it occurs in the chapter (vv. 12, 13, 16, etc.) ἐγήγερται may be rendered " hath risen " (not " hath been raised "), for in later Greek ἐγείρω was used in the passive and middle in the sense of " to rise " (cf. Grimm.). The emphasis laid upon the note of time " the third day " in the Scriptural accounts of the Resurrection, as well as in the Apostle's Creed, is remarkable. The main reason probably is because Christ had frequently predicted that He would rise on the third day (Matt. xvi. 21 ; xvii. 22 ; xx. 19 ; John ii. 19, etc.) ; possibly the point may be insisted upon also because the length of time afforded evidence that Christ had not merely fallen into a swoon, while, on the other hand, so short a period would have been quite inadequate to allow the cowering Apostles to alter their whole mental position and imagine a resurrection that was not real. Note again the appeal to the fulfilment of prophecy in " according to the Scriptures " (cf. Ps. xv. 10 ; John ii. 1 compared with Matt. xii. 40).

5. For the appearance to Cephas (Peter) see also Luke xxiv. 34. Instead of " the eleven " read " the Twelve " (δωδεκά, B & A K L P, Syr., Copt., Aeth.). It is an official name for the Apostolic

post hoc undecim : ' Deinde visus est plus quam quingentis fratribus simul : ex quibus multi manent usque adhuc, quidam autem dormierunt : ' Deinde visus est Iacobo, deinde apostolis omnibus :

Cephas ; and after that by the eleven. ' Then was He seen by more than five hundred brethren at once : of whom many remain until this present, and some are fallen asleep. ' After that, He was seen by James, then by all the apostles.

body, and is here applied though only ten were present, Judas being dead, and Thomas being absent when this appearance took place on the first Easter Sunday evening (John xx. 24). The appearances to the women, and to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke xxiv. 15 ff.) are here omitted.

6. Though the construction is changed, *ὅτι* being now dropped, we cannot infer, with Cornely, that the Apostle now proceeds to mention other appearances of which he had not hitherto spoken to the Corinthians, for it is extremely improbable that he had kept silence till now as to the appearance to himself mentioned in v. 8. Probably, then, the *ὅτι* is dropped merely to simplify the construction. The appearance to more than five hundred brethren is not mentioned anywhere else. Some, however, think that the reference is to the occasion in Matt. xxviii. 16-20, where though only the Apostles are mentioned as seeing the risen Lord, the presence of others is held to be implied from the fact that the Apostles are said to have adored Him, " but some doubted " (Matt. xxviii. 17). The doubters, it is urged, were others than Apostles. St. Paul mentions the large number of witnesses because it strengthens the evidence, and he challenges inquiry by stating that more than half of them are still alive. Such a public statement by the Apostle in 55 or 56 A.D. surely merits the serious reflection of all the adversaries of our Lord's Resurrection. " Are fallen asleep " suggests the waking in the resurrection at the last day.

7. The James referred to is doubtless James the Less (*ὁ μικρός*, Mark xv. 40), a kinsman of our Lord, and first Bishop of Jerusalem, for when St. Paul wrote this, James the Greater, brother of St. John, was long dead (Acts xii. 2), and if the reference were to him, some epithet would surely have been added to distinguish him from the still surviving and well-known Bishop of Jerusalem, who would otherwise be thought of. Though the majority of Protestant commentators deny the identity of the

* Novissime autem omnium * And last of all, He was seen
tanquam abortivo, visus est also by me, as by one born out

first Bishop of Jerusalem with the *Apostle* James, son of Alphaeus (Matt. x. 3, etc.), their identity seems far more probable (cf. Gal. i. 19, compared with Acts ix. 27). When this apparition to James occurred we cannot say, as it is not referred to elsewhere in the New Testament. St. Jerome (*De Vir. Illustr.* 2) speaks of an appearance to James, which he found recorded in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.—"Then to all the Apostles." It can no more be inferred from this that James was not an Apostle than that Peter (v. 5) was not. Neither is it probable that "Apostles" here is to be taken in a loose sense so as to include others outside the strictly Apostolic body, for throughout this Epistle, except in xii. 28, 29, where there is reference to those endowed with a charism, the term is used in every other instance of those who were Apostles in the strict sense (i. 1; iv. 9; ix. 1, 2, 5; xv. 9). The meaning, therefore, probably is that, besides the appearances to Peter, to the ten, to more than five hundred, and to James, there was also an appearance to the *Eleven*, who were "all the Apostles" at the time. If it be objected that the Corinthians could never have understood this to be the sense, especially as St. Paul has already spoken in v. 5 of an appearance to the *Twelve*, our reply is that the Apostle is merely recalling here what he had doubtless explained frequently to the Corinthians during the eighteen months in which he had founded their Church (Acts xviii. 11). When this appearance to the eleven took place we cannot be sure; it may be that on Low Sunday (John xx. 26-29), or that connected with the Ascension, or some other not recorded elsewhere.

8. "Last of all" suggests that the preceding appearances have been mentioned in chronological order. The appearance to St. Paul is of precisely the same kind as the others (ὡφθῆ; cf. vv. 5, 6, 7); in the same manner as Peter and the others, he really saw the risen Lord, so that the Rationalist theory about an imaginary vision, or an ecstatic mental state in St. Paul's case, is quite out of the question. A merely mental vision would have afforded no proof that Christ's body was risen, nor could the Apostle allege it here in support of his doctrine on corporal resurrection. Both he and the other witnesses referred to, therefore, beheld with the eyes of their bodies the risen body of Christ; and nothing short of this satisfies either the text or context. The reference

et mihi. * Ego enim sum minimus apostolorum, qui non sum dignus vocari apostolus, quoniam persecutus sum ecclesiam Dei. ¹⁰ Gratia autem Dei sum id quod sum, et gratia eius in me vacua non fuit, sed abun-

of due time. * For I am the least of the apostles, who am not worthy to be called an apostle, because I persecuted the church of God. ¹⁰ But by the grace of God, I am what I am; and His grace in me hath

here is doubtless to the appearance of Christ to St. Paul on the way to Damascus (Acts ix. 3 ff.).

There are various views as to why the Apostle compares himself to an abortive foetus. Some think the allusion is to the violence and suddenness of his conversion, but the simplest explanation is that suggested by the following verse: that he was spiritually immature, unformed, wholly unprepared to see Christ or be an Apostle at the time when the Lord appeared to him and caused him to be born, as it were, to this new life and dignity. "The *κῆποι* comes at the end with deep humility: 'to me also.' This appearance to the Apostle of the Gentiles completed the official evidence. He evidently knew of no later manifestations, and that to St. John in Patmos was after St. Paul's death. The fact that the manifestations had ended with the one to St. Paul is against the theory of hallucinations. If all the appearances had been hallucinations, they would probably have continued, for such things are infectious, because people see what they expect to see. But neither the Twelve nor St. Paul expected to see the Risen Lord, and some of them for a time doubted, not only the statement of others, but the evidence of their own eyes, for it seemed to be far too good to be true" (Rob.—Plumm.).

9. He proceeds to give the reason (*γάρ*) why he likened himself to an abortion. He had persecuted the Church of God, and was no more fit to be numbered among the Apostles than is an abortion to be numbered among men. So keenly does he feel this still that under that aspect he regards himself as the least of the Apostles, and even unworthy of the name (cf. Eph. iii. 8; 1 Tim. i. 12-16).

10. Yet, as there is question here of the value of his witness to Christ's resurrection, he does not rest satisfied with this depreciation of himself, but has something to add on his own behalf. However great his former unworthiness, he is now an Apostle by the grace of God (the reference is not to sanctifying grace,

dantius illis omnibus laboravi : not been void, but I have laboured more abundantly than all they ; yet not I, but the non ego autem, sed gratia Dei grace of God with me : " Sive enim ego, sive illi ; sic praedicamus, et sic preach, and so you have

but to the grace of Apostleship, Rom. xv. 15 ; Gal. i. 16 ; Eph. iii. 8), and that grace which was bestowed upon him (ἡ εἰς ἐμέ) was not fruitless or without result in his case ; nay, he laboured more abundantly than all the other Apostles (taken singly, probably). As the last clause savours of boasting, he at once corrects himself. The precise sense of the correction depends upon the reading to be adopted. B \equiv D F G, It., Vulg., Goth. read οὐκ ἐγὼ δέ, ἀλλ' ἡ χάρις τοῦ θεοῦ σὺν ἐμοί, and the meaning is : " but not I (alone), but the grace of God in co-operation with me." " Nec gratia sola, nec ipse solus, sed gratia Dei cum illo " (St. Aug.). But A E K L P, Sah., Arm., Aeth., St. Jer. repeat ἡ before σὺν ἐμοί, giving the meaning : but not I, but the grace of God, *which* is with me. The latter at first sight seems to attribute all to grace and nothing to the Apostle, but this ought to be understood as a Hebraism, meaning : *not so much* I as the grace of God with me ; for it was a well-known Hebraism when one thing was preferred to another, to deny or reject the other, as : " I will have mercy, and not sacrifice " (Osee. vi. 6 ; Matt. ix. 13), meaning that mercy was more acceptable than sacrifice.

11. After the digression regarding his Apostleship in vv. 9-10, occasioned by the reference to Christ's appearance to himself, σὺν now resumes the main subject of the evidence for Christ's resurrection. The aorist ἐπιστάμενοι looks back to the time of their conversion ; it is as if the Apostle said : whatever doubts may exist among you now, such is the faith you accepted then.

We need not suppose that St. Paul knew of no other evidence for Christ's resurrection than what he has here referred to. He omits to mention the appearance to Magdalen, to the women, to the two disciples on the way to Emmaus, to the disciples at the sea of Tiberias, and either that on Low Sunday or that in connection with the Ascension. He would certainly know of some of these, possibly of all ; but he selects for mention the evidence that would have most weight with the Corinthians : that of Peter, the Apostolic body, James, the more than five hundred brethren, and himself.

credidistis. ¹² Si autem Christus praedicatur quod resurrexit a mortuis, quomodo quidam dicunt in vobis, quoniam resurrectio mortuorum non est?

¹³ Si autem resurrectio mortu-

believed. ¹² Now if Christ be preached that He arose again from the dead, how do some among you say, that there is no resurrection of the dead?

¹³ But if there be no resurrection

12. From this verse it is clear that some members of the Corinthian Church (τινες ἐν ὑμῖν) denied the resurrection. But did they deny the resurrection of Christ, as well as that of all other men? The common opinion is that they did not, that they admitted the resurrection of Christ, while denying that of all others. But we confess we find it very hard to believe this. If so, why is St. Paul at such pains to prove the resurrection of Christ? And why in the present verse is the doctrine of these people represented as an absolute denial of resurrection (ὅτι ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν)? No doubt all the Corinthian Christians, when they first accepted the faith, believed in the resurrection of Christ (v. 11), but that was quite compatible with scepticism on this point afterwards. If it be said that they could hardly retain the name of Christians at all if they denied Christ's resurrection, we may reply that probably they thought it sufficient to believe in His Divinity and in the glorification of His human soul. Some prominent Anglican Divines have recently taken up this very attitude. If, then, we are right in holding that the error in question consisted in the denial of all resurrection, the object of the present verse is to call attention to the fact that such a view is shown to be false in at least one case by the public preaching of the proved fact of the resurrection of Christ's body.

13. This verse seems to bear out the view we have taken of the preceding. It is as if he said: but if these erring brethren are to be believed, neither hath Christ risen—not only shall other men not rise, but neither hath Christ risen. This, indeed, would be a *reductio ad absurdum* had these erring Corinthians believed in the resurrection of Christ; but the Apostle seems to believe that they were quite prepared to accept the conclusion in full, and deny Christ's resurrection, for he again sets about establishing the latter by new arguments. Thus we take this verse to be merely a full setting forth of what was involved in the saying of these erring Corinthians "that there is not a resurrection of dead people."

The common view, however, of vv. 12, 13 is that the Apostle

orum non est : neque Christus resurrexit. ¹⁴ Si autem Christus non resurrexit, inanis est ergo prædicatio nostra, inanis est et fides vestra : ¹⁵ Invenimur autem et falsi testes Dei : quoniam testimonium diximus adversus Deum, quod suscitaverit Christum, quem non suscitavit, si mortui non resurgunt.

of the dead, then Christ is not risen again. ¹⁴ And if Christ be not risen again, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain. ¹⁵ Yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have given testimony against God, that He hath raised up Christ ; whom He hath not raised up if the dead rise not again.

is arguing from the admitted resurrection of Christ to the general resurrection of the just, and that the sense of v. 13 is that if there is not a resurrection awaiting the dead (the just) generally, then neither hath Christ risen. But those who adopt this view are greatly at variance in the explanation they offer of the connection thus set up in v. 13 between the resurrection of Christ and that of the just. The more common opinion is that St. Paul is arguing from the nexus between the different parts of the mystical body of Christ, and contending that if the members are not to rise, then neither has the Head (Christ Himself) risen. But who can believe that the Apostle deals in this brief and veiled way with the general resurrection, which in the view I am opposing was the only point on which some of the Corinthians erred, while he dwells at length (4-11 ; 14-20) on the resurrection of Christ, which is supposed not to have been denied ? The true view, then, seems to be that down to v. 20 he is treating of the resurrection of Christ, which was at least implicitly denied together with the general resurrection ; that in vv. 12, 13 he points out how the error of some of the Corinthians, inasmuch as it was a denial of all resurrection, involved the denial of Christ's resurrection, and that having fully established Christ's resurrection he proceeds in v. 20 to treat of the general resurrection.

14. The error at Corinth involved a denial of Christ's resurrection (v. 13) ; and feeling apparently that some of the Corinthians did not shrink at even this, the Apostle now uses new arguments to prove that Christ must be risen. The gist of the present verse is that if Christ be not risen, " without substance " or " devoid of truth " (κενόν, " inanis ") is our message, and your faith.—*Ἀρα* has the force of " in that case."

15. Another result of Christ's not having risen would be that the Apostles would be false witnesses against God ; θεοῦ is the

¹⁶ Nam si mortui non resurgunt, neque Christus resurrexit. ¹⁷ Quod si Christus non resurrexit, vana est fides vestra, adhuc enim estis in peccatis vestris. ¹⁸ Ergo et qui dormierunt in Christo, perierunt. ¹⁹ Si in hac vita tantum in Christo sperantes sumus, miserabiliores sumus omnibus hominibus.

¹⁶ For if the dead rise not again, neither is Christ risen again. ¹⁷ And if Christ be not risen again, your faith is vain, for you are yet in your sins. ¹⁸ Then they also that are fallen asleep in Christ, are perished. ¹⁹ If in this life only we have hope in Christ, we are of all men most miserable.

objective genitive, rather than the subjective: false witnesses against God, rather than false witnesses in the service of God.

16. This is merely a solemn repetition in a slightly different form of v. 13, the Apostle intending to draw new inferences from it (vv. 17, 18).

17. "Vain," i.e., useless, "is your faith, for you are still in your sins." Note that in the Greek and the Latin "vain" is represented here by different words from those used in v. 14. In v. 14 he declared their faith to be without substance or devoid of truth if Christ was not risen; now he adds that it is useless (μαρτα, "vana"), since Christ (by His failure to fulfil His promises) would be shown to be an impostor, and an impostor could not redeem men.

18. Another result, arising necessarily out of the preceding would be: then they also who fell asleep in Christ, i.e., who died believing and hoping in Christ, have perished. It is not meant that they are annihilated, but that they have gone into the next world with their sins upon them and liable to eternal punishment. For ἀπόλλοιμι in this sense, cf. i. 18; viii. 11; 2 Cor. ii. 15, etc.

19. Μόνον probably qualifies the whole preceding clause: if in this life we have hoped in Christ—and there is nothing more to hope or expect (μόνον), then we are more to be pitied (ἐλαινότεροι) than all men. The Apostle has shown that in the hypothesis of Christ's not having risen, Christians must be still in their sins, and destined to eternal punishment when they die, so that a happy immortality even for their souls is excluded; and now he concludes with the thought that in such hypothesis they are more to be pitied than all other men, inasmuch as their faith forces them to deny themselves, while it brings upon them suffering and persecution. Ἐλαινότεροι should be rendered

¶ Nunc autem Christus resurrexit a mortuis primitiæ dormientium : ²¹ Quoniam quidem per hominem mors, et per hominem resurrectio mor-

²⁰ But now Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that sleep. ²¹ For by a man came death, and by a man the resurrection of the

"more to be pitied" rather than "more miserable"; the two things are not the same. A may be more deserving of pity than B, though, absolutely speaking, B is more miserable and wretched. Even if all hope of future reward with Christ were cut off, Christians leading a virtuous life would not be as wretched and miserable as some sinners, but they would certainly be more to be pitied.

The various arguments in vv. 13-19 are meant to show that the doctrine of the $\tau\omega\varsigma$ (v. 12), i.e., the denial of all bodily resurrection, cannot be true, seeing that it involves such awful and incredible consequences.

20. But now, as things are ($\nu\upsilon\upsilon\iota$ $\delta\epsilon$), Christ has risen from the dead, as the Apostle has just proved, and He has risen as the first-fruits of them that sleep. "First-fruits" imply other fruits of the same kind, and the Apostle evidently means that the resurrection of Christ's body shall one day be followed by the resurrection of the bodies of all those who shall have slept in Christ, and so he passes on now to speak of the resurrection of all the just. For "first-fruits" see Lev. xxiii. 10-11, where LXX. have the same word $\alpha\pi\omicron\tau\epsilon\rho\chi\eta$. It is the common opinion, to which the present verse gives support (cf. Acts xxvi. 23; Col. i. 18) that no one, not even those mentioned in Matt. xxvii. 52 ff., rose to an immortal life before Christ. St. Matthew probably anticipates in his narrative, and seems to record as happening immediately after Christ's death what really followed His resurrection. The tombs were opened by the earthquake at the death of Christ, but the bodies did not arise till after the resurrection. As the rest of the harvest was similar in kind to the first-fruits, so by those that sleep are meant here only the just who like Christ shall rise to a glorious resurrection, for it is only of the resurrection of the just that St. Paul treats in this chapter.

21. "For since (read "*quoniam enim*" in Vulgate) through a man (came) death, through a man also (came) resurrection of the dead." Here the Apostle points out how fitting it is that resurrection should come through a man. Death—death of the

tuorum. ²² Et sicut in Adam omnes moriuntur, ita et in Christo omnes vivificabuntur. ²³ Unusquisque autem in suo ordine, primitiæ Christus :

dead. ²² And as in Adam all die, so also in Christ all shall be made alive. ²³ But every one in his own order : the first-fruits Christ, then they that

body, of course, is meant—came through Adam, for though man is naturally mortal, God had raised him above his nature and endowed him with immortality, and Adam through his sin forfeited this gift for himself and his posterity. We may admit, as geology seems to require, that animals died before Adam sinned and long even before he existed ; the Apostle merely means that through Adam's sin death came to the human race.

22. In Vulgate read "sicut enim" (ὥστε γάρ). Here the Apostle explains definitely what he meant by the preceding verse ; the man who brought death is Adam, and the man who brought resurrection is Christ. The change of preposition—*ἐν* instead of the previous *διὰ*—probably introduces a new thought, namely, that as we die not only through Adam, but in some sense *in* him by our community of nature, so we shall be raised to a glorious life not only through Christ, but in Him, as being His members incorporated in Him by faith and grace (vi. 14, 15). The second "all" (πάντες) in this verse is not equally extensive with the first, for all men whether good or bad must die, but the whole context here, and especially the next verse : "the first-fruits Christ, then *those who are Christ's*," makes it more probable that the Apostle is not speaking of the resurrection of all absolutely, but only of the resurrection of all the just. Of course, he believed in the resurrection of the wicked also, as we pointed out in the introduction to this chapter, but in this letter to the Corinthians he confines his attention to the resurrection of the just, either because this alone was of practical importance for the Corinthian Christians or because it was this that was discussed and questioned among them.

A good many weighty authorities, however, including St. Thomas, hold that the reference is to the resurrection of all, bad and good ; not, of course, in the Universalist sense, that even the wicked shall be raised to a glorious life and saved eternally, but in the sense that all shall be quickened to life through Christ, some to a life of glory, others to one of eternal misery.

23. But each (shall be made alive) in his own order (both of time and dignity), Christ being first in both respects. St. Clement

deinde ii qui sunt Christi, qui in adventu eius crediderunt.
 24 Deinde finis ; cum tradiderit regnum Deo et Patri, cum evacuaverit omnem principatum, et potestatem, et virtu-

are of Christ, who have believed in His coming. 24 Afterwards the end, when He shall have delivered up the kingdom to God and the Father, when He shall have brought to nought all principality, and power, and

of Rome (1 Cor. xxxvii) uses *τάγμα* of a soldier's position or rank in the army, and the idea of rank or dignity is included in the word here, conjoined, however, with a reference to the order of time. The last part of the verse is to be read : *ἔπειτα οἱ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν τῇ παρουσίᾳ αὐτοῦ*, "then they who are Christ's, at His coming." That is to say, after Christ, the first-fruits of the resurrection, then they who are Christ's shall be raised to a glorious resurrection at His second coming. Hence "qui" and "crediderunt" of the Vulgate must be omitted. *Παρουσία* primarily means "presence," then "arrival" or "coming," and here, as in a number of other passages of the New Testament, it refers to Christ's Second Coming. It was used as a technical term for the arrival of any great personage (cf. Deissmann, *Light*, pp. 372, 382).

It will be noted that nothing is said of the resurrection of those who are not Christ's, and this confirms what was said above on v. 22, that St. Paul is speaking here only of the resurrection of the just.

24. "Then the end." Some have taken the reference to be to the end of the resurrection, as though there were a veiled allusion here to the resurrection of the wicked, but since the Apostle is speaking of a resurrection of which Christ is the first-fruits, any reference to the resurrection of the wicked would be out of place. The meaning, therefore, is : then comes the end of the world (cf. Matt. xxiv. 14 ; Mark xiii. 7 ; Luke xxi. 9). The remainder of the verse may be rendered : "when He delivereth up (read the pres. subj. *παράδωκῶ*, & A D F P, or *παράδωκῶ*, B F G, not the aor. subj. *παράδω*, K L) the kingdom to God who is also Father, after He shall have brought to nought every principality and authority and power." "*Ὅταν*" indicates that the time of this delivering up is uncertain. The kingdom is the Messianic kingdom of the Church militant. Christ's God and Father is meant, for if the reference were to our God and Father *ἡμῶν* would be required. We need have no difficulty

tem. ²⁵ Oportet autem illum virtute. ²⁶ For He must reign, regnare, donec ponat omnes inimicos sub pedibus eius. *Until He hath put all His*

about such an expression; St. Paul uses it elsewhere, *e.g.*, Rom. xv. 6; 2 Cor. i. 3, and Christ Himself on the cross cried out: "My God, my God, why hast Thou forsaken Me?" (Matt. xxvii. 46). Of course there is question of Christ as man.

"Principality" and "authority" and "power" seem to refer to all the adversaries of God, and of Christ, and of Christ's elect, whether demons, men, or things. They are the same as the enemies of God (v. 25), and among them is death (v. 26).

Christ as God has a kingdom that of course shall never end. Even as man He has an eternal kingdom in the Church triumphant, which He purchased with His blood: "and of His kingdom there shall be no end" (Luke i. 33); but His kingdom of the Church militant shall cease as such at the general resurrection, when He shall deliver it up, or hand it over in its new condition to the Father, bringing to a close at the same time that part of His kingly office which has reference to the Church militant. This seems a reasonable view of this difficult idea of Christ's delivering up the kingdom. For various Patristic views on the subject, which, however, do not afford very much light, see Cornely on this verse.

25. "*For He must reign*" (ὅτι γὰρ—*oportet enim*), etc. He proves here what has been signified in the preceding verse: that Christ can hand over the kingdom to the Father, only after He has vanquished all His enemies. For it is necessary in the designs of God (ὅτι) that He continue to exercise His royal office over the Church militant until He has put all His enemies under His feet. The point of the proof lies in the allusion to Psalm cix. 1, which predicted Christ's triumph over all His enemies. The psalm is not quoted, for in the psalm God the Father is represented as saying to Christ: "Sit at my right hand, until I make thy enemies thy footstool," whereas the context here shows that it is Christ Himself who puts His enemies under His feet. But the allusion to the psalm is sufficient to recall the Divine promise that Christ was finally to triumph over all His enemies. If, as we think more probable, there is question of Christ's kingly office in connection with the Church militant, then "until" ("donec") denotes the time when that office shall cease. Many, however, have interpreted the verse in the sense that Christ shall reign

²⁶ Novissima autem inimica destructur mors: omnia enim subiecit sub pedibus eius. Cum autem dicat: ²⁷ Omnia sub-

enemies under His feet. ²⁶ And the enemy death shall be destroyed last, *For He hath put all things under His feet.* And whereas He saith, ²⁷ *All things*

not only *until* He has vanquished all His enemies, but *also afterwards*. The one point about which there might be doubt, they say, was whether He would succeed in reigning until He had overcome all His enemies. This, then, is asserted, without its being implied that He shall cease to reign afterwards. No doubt this is quite true, and if there were question of Christ's absolute reign as God or even of His reign over the whole Church militant and triumphant, we might explain in that way; but since the context (especially v. 36: "When He delivereth up the kingdom"), appears to make it more probable that there is reference to His reign over the Church militant, the view set forth above seems preferable. In Scriptural usage "until" may denote the time at which a certain condition of things changes, or it may merely denote the time up to which a certain condition of things shall endure, without implying anything as to its continuance or non-continuance afterwards. In our view, it is used in the former sense here; but it is often used also in the latter sense as when God says: "Until you grow old, I am" (Is. xlv. 4, LXX.), or when St. Paul tells Timothy: "Until I come, attend to reading" (1 Tim. iv. 13) or when St. Matthew says of the Blessed Virgin that St. Joseph "knew her not until she brought forth her first-born Son" (Matt. i. 25).

26. Death, the last surviving enemy, shall be destroyed (*καταργεῖται*, present for the certain future) in the general resurrection. Again one of the psalms is alluded to rather than quoted, for in the psalm we have: "Thou hast put all things under his feet" (Ps. viii. 6). In the literal sense the psalm refers to man as the king of this visible creation, to whom all things were subjected, but what was true of man in the state of innocence, was still more true in the mystical sense of the perfect man, Jesus Christ, to whom therefore here, as in Heb. ii. 8, St. Paul applies the passage. This subjection of all His enemies to Christ is gradually going on, and will be completed only at the general resurrection.

27. "But when He saith." God the Father, speaking through the Psalmist, is referred to, or if the *futurum exactum* (*ὅταν δέ*

iecta sunt ei ; sine dubio praeter eum qui subiecit ei omnia. *are put under Him ; undoubtedly, He is excepted who put all things under Him.*
 28 Cum autem subiecta fuerint illi omnia : tunc et ipse Filius subiectus erit ei qui subiecit *28 And when all things shall be subdued unto Him, then the Son also Himself shall be subject unto Him that put all*

ἐστὶν, " when He shall have said ") is to be pressed, God declaring at the end of the world that all Christ's enemies have been vanquished. The Apostle points out that in the universal subjection to Christ, it is manifest that an exception must be made in regard to Him (God), who subjected all things to Him (Christ).

28. Here it is declared that after Christ's triumph over all His enemies, even over the last of them, death, in the general resurrection, the Son Himself shall be subjected to Him (God) who subjected all things to Him (the Son). It is quite improbable that the reference is merely to the subjection to God of Christ's mystical body, whether collectively or individually, for nowhere else is the mystical body spoken of as " the Son." Nor does it seem likely that the reference is to the subjection of the Son as God to the eternal Father in the sense that He would acknowledge Himself to have proceeded from the Father as the source of Deity (so St. Chrysostom), for throughout the rest of the passage there is question of real subjection. We must therefore understand the statement of the Son as man, and we think the reference is to His subjection to the Blessed Trinity. As man, however, He is and always has been subject, and what then is the meaning of the present statement ? Perhaps it is made, lest anyone should imagine that in the hour of His perfect triumph and at the head of His glorious army of the elect, He should be independent even of God. As God He had Himself, together with the Father and the Holy Ghost, subjected all things to Himself as man, and now, even in the day of His triumph, and in the new capacity of Head of a triumphant Church, He shall be made subject to that same Blessed Trinity which subjected all things to Him as man. The passage is indeed a mysterious one, and perhaps it is only in the light of glory we shall see all it contains. The concluding words : " That God may be all in all " mean apparently that the period of mediation through Christ's humanity is past, and that henceforth the relations of the Blessed Trinity with the elect shall be immediate and all-pervading.

sibi omnia, ut sit Deus omnia things under Him, that God
in omnibus. may be all in all.

²⁹ Alioquin quid facient qui ²⁹ Otherwise what shall they

Πᾶσι is doubtless masculine, but from the context refers only to the elect, so that it is absurd to seek here an argument for the final salvation of the devils, and the final restitution of all things.

29. After the revelation of mysteries connected with the end (vv. 21-28), in which the Apostle departs somewhat from the main subject of the resurrection, even though he introduces in the passage a new argument for the resurrection of the dead, based on the Psalmist's prediction that all things, and therefore death, should one day be made subject to Christ, he now ceases to declare mysteries and returns again to the main argument. The meaning of this verse is very much disputed. We may set aside at once, I believe, all interpretations which cast doubt on the accepted reading, for the reading is thoroughly attested; also interpretations which understand "for the dead" as meaning "for those *spiritually* dead," or "for dead *works*," for the whole context makes it clear that there must be reference neither to those dead in sin, nor to dead or sinful works, but to people dead corporally.

Let us see then how the text runs. "Otherwise (for *that* in this sense see vi. 10; vii. 14) what shall they do (i.e., how shall they be thought to act—'nonne stulte agere videbuntur?'—Grimm.) that are baptized for the dead? If dead people rise not at all, why then are they baptized for them?" It seems clear that the Apostle is arguing for the resurrection of the dead from the practice of some people who received some sort of baptism for the dead. The question then is: what is meant by οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι ὑπὲρ τῶν νεκρῶν?

(1) St. Chrysostom and many of the Greeks understand of Christians generally, who receive baptism with a view to *the* resurrection of the dead, i.e., with faith in the resurrection, which all catechumens before their baptism professed in the recitation of the Creed. Against this, however, is the fact that the words italicised, which are necessary to this sense, are not in the text, but have to be supplied; also that the article with the participle, οἱ βαπτιζόμενοι, seems to point to a certain class, and not to Christians generally.

baptizantur pro mortuis, si do that are baptized for the
 omnino mortui non resurgunt ? dead, if the dead rise not again
 ut quid et baptizantur pro illis ? at all ? why are they then

(2) Estius, following St. Epiphanius, understands of those catechumens in whose case baptism had been deferred till they were baptised on their death-bed, when there could be no earthly motive for receiving the Sacrament ; who, therefore, asked and received baptism in view of the state beyond the grave. Hence he takes " for the dead " to mean " for the state of the dead," urging that " from the dead " often means " from the state of the dead." Against this is the fact that " for the dead " nowhere else means " for the state of the dead," and so if this were the Apostle's meaning, he would certainly have conveyed it most obscurely.

(3) Others have taken *ὅτι* in a local sense, and understood the reference to be to people baptised over the graves of the martyrs, as if this implied belief that the martyrs' bodies would one day rise again. But *ὅτι* occurs nowhere else in the New Testament in a local sense (cf. Grimm.), nor is there any evidence of such a practice as that here suggested.

(4) Others take the baptism referred to here to be metaphorical, a baptism of mortification and affliction (Luke xii. 50 ; Mark x. 38), and explain : " Otherwise what shall they do, who pray and fast and mortify themselves for the dead ? " But this metaphorical sense of baptism is very rare, being found only in the two passages just referred to, and there in the mouth of Christ in reference, not to ordinary mortifications, but to His baptism in His blood. This being so, is it likely that the Corinthians could be expected to think of a metaphorical baptism here ? Besides, if this were the sense, the Apostle, as Estius points out, should have written " who baptise themselves," i.e., undergo voluntary mortifications, rather than " who are baptised."

(5) Without delaying on other interpretations, of which there are many, we think that the obvious view, which has also been the most common among commentators, is the least improbable. It supposes that the Apostle alludes to, without approving, the practice of vicarious baptism received by living friends for people who died without baptism. Tertullian certainly understood the passage in this sense (*Adv. Marc.* v. 10 ; *De Resurr.* xlviii.), as did also Ambler. The Apostle's meaning will then be : if the dead do not arise, what shall those people do—shall they not

²⁹ Ut quid et nos periclitamur baptized for them ? ³⁰ Why omni hora ? ³¹ Quotidie morior also are we in danger every per vestram gloriam, fratres, hour ? ³¹ I die daily, I protest by your glory, brethren, which quam habeo in CHRISTO IESU I have in CHRIST JESUS our

appear to act stupidly—who are baptised for their dead friends in order to help them beyond the grave ; if dead people rise not at all, why then are they baptised for them ? If it be objected that the Apostle would not argue from an ignorant and erroneous practice, one must admit that it is indeed strange he should do so ; at the same time it is possible that he might appeal to the practice, without approving of it, all the more so as he makes it clear enough by the words he uses : “ What shall *they* do ? ” that he is not speaking of an ordinary Christian practice. It is true, we have no other evidence than what this verse seems to contain for the existence of such a practice in St. Paul’s time, but later on, St. Chrysostom says of the Marcionite heretics : “ when one of their catechumens is dead, they hide the living man under the bed of the dead one : then they approach the corpse and converse with it, and ask it if it wishes to receive baptism : thereupon, when it answers nothing, the man hidden underneath answers for it, that he would like to be baptised ; and so they baptise him instead of the departed.” It is, of course, possible that, as St. Chrysostom thought, this Marcionite practice was based on a false interpretation of the present verse ; but it is also quite possible that the Apostle really refers to an erroneous practice in his own time, of which it was a survival.

30. Another result of denying the resurrection would be that it would make a great deal of the Christian life absurd. “ We also ” implies that the Apostle and whoever are classed with him, are not among those who received baptism for the dead ; but the action of both parties alike bespoke a belief in the resurrection. Some refer “ we ” to all Christians, others to all the Apostles, others to all who incurred great risks for the Gospel.

31. For the hope of the resurrection he was exposed to danger of death daily (cf. “ in deaths often,” 2 Cor. xi. 23). So he tells them, and he confirms the strong statement by a solemn protestation : “ by the glorying in you, brethren, which I have in Christ Jesus our Lord.” The sense of the verse is : “ I protest by the holy pride I take in you, brethren, that I am daily exposed to death.” *Nῆ* may introduce either a solemn affirmation or an

Domino nostro. ³² Si (secundum hominem) ad bestias pugnavi Ephesi, quid mihi prodest, si mortui non resurgunt ?

Lord. ³² If (according to man) I fought with beasts at Ephesus, what doth it profit me, if the dead rise not again ? *Let us eat*

oath. St. Augustine (*De Serm. in Monte* 1, 51) understood the Apostle to swear in the present instance, but a solemn affirmation seems adequate and more appropriate to the circumstances.

32. Here he alludes to one such danger, which was probably recent. The phrase "according to man" ought not to be put in parenthesis. It means "from merely human motives," and without hope of a future resurrection.—"I fought with beasts" (ἐσθριουόχῃς). "St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Romans, uses the same word: 'All the way from Syria to Rome I have to fight with beasts, bound as I am to ten leopards, that is, a file of soldiers.' This citation from almost a contemporary author, and the fact that there is no record elsewhere of St. Paul being thrown to wild beasts, nor would any magistrate have dared so to treat a Roman citizen (Acts xxii. 26), compels us to take the phrase metaphorically of some such persons at Ephesus as those who 'were hardened and believed not, speaking evil of the way of the Lord before the multitude' (Acts xix. 9)." (Rick.).

"If the dead arise not, let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." For the sixth time he alludes, in the words "if the dead arise not," to the saying of some among the Christians of Corinth that there is no resurrection of the dead (v. 12). The Vulgate connects "if the dead arise not" with what precedes, but it is better to take it, as the Greeks commonly did, with "let us eat, etc." The latter words are found in precisely the same form in LXX. of Isaias xxii. 13, and possibly it is from there the Apostle takes them, though we think it more likely that he quotes them as a current Epicurean proverb. In Isaias they are represented as the words of Jews who scoff at prophetic warnings of their impending destruction, drawing from their pretended acceptance of these warnings the grotesque ironical conclusion that they ought to eat and drink while they have time, instead of concluding, as they would if they really believed the warnings (for they did not deny a future life), that they ought to pray and mortify themselves while they had time. If the Apostle takes the words from Isaias, he accommodates them to his purpose, to convey the conclusion that would be ordinarily drawn from a denial of the resurrection, a conclusion to enjoy

Manducemus et bibamus, cras *and drink, for to-morrow we shall*
 enim moriemur. ²² Nolite se- *die.* ²³ Be not seduced : *Evil*
 duci : corrumpunt mores bonos *communications corrupt good*

this life to the full, seeing that death was to be the end and extinction of man. St. Chrysostom says that it is not the Apostle's own conclusion, even though there were no resurrection, because "it was recompense enough for him that his action was pleasing to God." If the Apostle quotes a common Epicurean saying, he uses it in its received sense, but again not so much to express his own conclusion as that which would commonly be drawn from a denial of the resurrection.

It will be noted that the two arguments, that in v. 29, and that in vv. 30-32, proceed upon the hypothesis that if there be no resurrection of the body, there is no happy immortality for the soul, otherwise, of course, the obvious reply might be made to the Apostle that the action of those who were baptised for dead friends, and the sufferings of Christians, would still avail for the soul, even though there were no resurrection of the body. How then, we may ask, is he justified in arguing on such an hypothesis? In the first place, we cannot accept the reply given by many that the adversaries against whom the Apostle is arguing would be prepared to admit that there was no immortality for the soul if there was no resurrection of the body; for these adversaries were Christians of some kind (v. 12: "some among you"), and it is hard to see how any people calling themselves Christians could be prepared to reject the immortality of the soul. Hence I think the Apostle takes for granted here what he has said already, vv. 13-18: if there be no resurrection of the dead, then Christ is not risen; and if Christ be not risen, there is no *happy* immortality for the soul. The present arguments will still have a value of their own, though dependent on vv. 13-18, inasmuch as they show that both those who were baptised for dead friends, and those like the Apostle who risked their lives for the Gospel, prove by their conduct their conviction of the possibility of a happy immortality, and of what has been shown to be inseparably connected with it, a resurrection of the body.

33. "Evil communications," etc. This is a line from the *Thais*, a play of the Athenian comedian Menander, only fragments of which have survived. In quoting it, the Apostle seems to have in mind the evil words of v. 32: "let us eat and drink," etc.; and if so, those words themselves are to be regarded as a

colloquia mala. ³⁴ Evigilate iusti, et nolite peccare : ignorantiam enim Dei quidam habent, ad reverentiam vobis loquor.

³⁵ Sed dicet aliquis : Quomodo resurgunt mortui ? quae live corpore venient ? ³⁶ Insipiens, tu quod seminas non vivificatur, nisi prius moriatur.

manners. ³⁴ Awake, ye just, and sin not. For some have not the knowledge of God, I speak it to your shame.

³⁵ But some man will say : How do the dead rise again ? or with what manner of body shall they come ? ³⁶ Senseless man, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die

proverb current in St. Paul's time rather than as a quotation from Isaiah. The present quotation from a Greek author, and the quotations in Acts xvii. 28 and Tit. i. 12, prove what we might indeed expect of a man like Paul reared in an educational centre like Tarsus, that he was well acquainted with Greek literature. In the two latter instances he states explicitly that he is quoting an author, and not merely a popular proverb.

34. Instead of "awake, ye just," the Revised Version has : "awake up righteously" ; and this is better, for the adverb *δικαίως* is undoubtedly the true reading. The Greek verb rendered "awake" means literally "to return to one's sober senses from a state of drunkenness." The aorist imperative (*ἐκνήψατε*) coming between two presents gives the meaning : *once for all* shake off your stupor. St. Chrysostom says he addresses them as if they were drunk or mad. In "some who have ignorance of God" he alludes to those who, knowing not the power of God to raise the dead, denied the resurrection of the body (cf. Matt. xxii. 29), and it is these he addresses so severely. The last words of the verse are rightly rendered : "I speak it to your shame" — "*ad verecundiam vestram*," as the Vulgate itself renders above in vi. 5.

35. The Apostle now proceeds to treat of the possibility and manner of the resurrection. Some hold that this verse contains only one question, the second being but an explanation of the first. But it seems better to understand two questions, the first being : how is it possible that the dead rise again ? the second : with what manner of body shall they come ? for v. 36 seems intended to show the possibility of resurrection. The present *ἵπχοντα* has a future sense, as the Vulgate takes it.

36. This familiar illustration shows the possibility of the dead body rising again out of the earth and supplies the answer to the first question. The seed that is sown does not bud into life until

³⁷ Et quod seminas, non corpus quod futurum est, seminas, sed nudum granum, ut puta tritici, aut alicuius ceterorum. ³⁸ Deus autem dat illi corpus sicut vult : et unicuique seminum proprium corpus. ³⁹ Non omnis caro, eadem caro : sed alia quidem hominum, alia vero pecorum, alia volucrum, alia first. ³⁷ And that which thou sowest, thou sowest not the body that shall be ; but bare grain, as of wheat, or of some of the rest. ³⁸ But God giveth it a body as He will : and to every seed its proper body. ³⁹ All flesh is not the same flesh : but one is the flesh of men, another of beasts, another

it has first passed through a process of decomposition or dissolution, here called death (cf. John xii. 24-25). It is implied of course that similarly the death of the human body, and its dissolution in the grave, may well be the prelude to a new life. If it be objected that the seed contains within itself the principle of life, while the human corpse is bereft of the soul, the principle of its life, we may reply that the corpse is destined in the designs of God to be united again to the soul—the Apostle has already proved this in establishing the resurrection of the body—and this constitutes for it an extrinsic principle of a new life. The comparison may not be perfect, as indeed few such comparisons can be, but at any rate it shows the possibility of passing through corruption to a better life. We must read *σπέρων* not *σπόρων* but the anarthrous nominative is used for the vocative (See J. H. Moulton, *Gr.*, p. 71).

37. Here he passes to the second question, and goes on to show that the risen body shall be different in quality from that which was laid in the grave. "A bare grain," i.e., without bud or stem or leaf. For *ἐι τόχοι* see above on xiv. 10. The comparison cannot be urged too far ; the seed and the plant that springs from it are not numerically the same, but it is otherwise with the corpse and the risen body (vv. 42-44). The point of the comparison lies in the difference of qualities between what goes into the ground and what comes up again.

38. "But God gives it a body as He *willed*" (*ἡθέλησεν*). The aorist points back to the creation, when God established the laws of nature. God gives to each of the seeds the body that is proper to its kind, and hence to every corpse He can give a suitable resurrection-body.

39. Note the descending scale, the reverse of Gen. i. 20-27. The God who fashioned this variety of bodies can surely make a resurrection-body different in quality from them all. He speaks

autem piscium. ⁴⁰ Et corpora coelestia, et corpora terrestria : sed alia quidem coelestium gloria, alia autem terrestrium.

⁴¹ Alia claritas solis, alia claritas lunae, et alia claritas stellarum. Stella enim a stella differt in claritate : ⁴² Sic et resurrectio mortuorum. Seminatur in corruptione, surget in incorrup-

of birds, another of fishes.

⁴⁰ And *there are* bodies celestial, and bodies terrestrial : but, one *is the* glory of the celestial, and another of the terrestrial.

⁴¹ One *is the* glory of the sun, another the glory of the moon, and another the glory of the stars. For star differeth from star in glory. ⁴² So also is the resurrection of the dead. It is sown in corruption, it shall

here of flesh instead of body, probably to insinuate that the dead shall rise in true flesh, and not in an ethereal body.

40. The "heavenly bodies" are without doubt those mentioned in the next verse, and not either angels or saints, for the Apostle is showing from the variety of visible things the possibility of yet another body suited to the resurrection. Ἐρίπα signifies that there is a *wide* difference between the heavenly and earthly bodies.

41. There is a difference too, though not so great (ἄλλῃ) between the heavenly bodies themselves. "Tribuit autem Apostolus gloriam corporibus coelestibus et terrestribus metaphorice, quatenus habent ejusmodi in se qualitates, ex quibus quodammodo laudentur et glorificentur" (Estius).

42. The words "so also (shall be) the resurrection of the dead," are so general that they probably include the idea of differences in glory (according to differences of merit) between the different risen bodies, though what follows here shows that the Apostle is thinking not so much of these differences as of the difference between the body of the resurrection and the mortal body. The God who is the author of all those varieties of bodies can surely make yet another kind of body, fashioning anew the body of our lowliness and making it like the glorified body of Christ (cf. Phil. iii. 21).

As v. 44 and indeed the whole context shows, it is the body that is said to be sown, i.e., buried in the earth (rather than planted in this world) that shall rise again. "It shall rise (ἐγείρεται = pres. for future) in incorruption." This has always been taken to imply freedom, not only from death, but from every suffering that could lead to death, and hence *impassibility* (impassibilitas). See Apoc. vii. 16.

tione. ⁴³ Seminatur in ignobilitate, surget in gloria : seminatur in infirmitate, surget in virtute :

⁴⁴ Seminatur corpus animale, surget corpus spiritale. Si est corpus animale, est et spiritale,

rise in incorruption. ⁴³ It is sown in dishonour, it shall rise in glory. It is sown in weakness, it shall rise in power.

⁴⁴ It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body. If there be a natural body, there is also a spiritual body,

43. Two other qualities of a glorified body : "glory" or "brightness" (*claritas*), which will be the effect of the glorified soul upon the body, in allusion to which our Lord said : "Then shall the just shine like the sun in the kingdom of their Father" (Matt. xiii. 43); and "power" (*agilitas*), implying a perfect vigour in all its powers and members, so that it will be "*expeditum et habile ad obediendum spiritui*" (St. Thomas).

44. "A spiritual body"—not in the sense that it will cease to be material (Luke xxiv. 39), or that it will be composed of air or ether or light, for it will be the same body that went into the grave, and hence of the same nature, though transformed we cannot say how much. Many think "spiritual" here denotes a fourth quality (*subtilitas*), but the change of construction, and the next clause, and v. 46, make it more probable that "spiritual" includes the preceding qualities, and sums up in a word the entire condition of the risen bodies of the just. It is sown, then, a natural (*ψυχικόν*) body, i.e., a body subject to the soul considered as the *ψυχή*, or seat of vegetative and sensitive life, and hence liable to all the corruption and weakness and imperfection incidental to such a body; but it shall rise a spiritual (*πνευματικόν*) body, i.e., a body subject and adapted to the soul considered as the *πνεῦμα* or seat of intellectual and spiritual life, and endowed, as far as a body can be, with spiritual and supernatural qualities. "Corpus videlicet nullis amplius alimentis, nullo somno, nulla generatione, nullis vitalium facultatum functionibus indigens, sed animae intelligenti et beatae summa obtemperandi facilitate attemperatum" (Corluy, *Spicel.* I, p. 322). "The life of the risen body then shall be rather *spiritual* than *animal*; though it is not for us to pronounce where spirituality ends and animality begins. In particular, we cannot deny sensation to the bodies of the risen just" (Rick.).

"If there is a natural body, there is also a spiritual." Read : *εἰ ἔστιν σῶμα ψυχικόν, ἔστιν καὶ πνευματικόν*. The sense is : if there

sicut scriptum est. ⁴⁵ Factus as it is written : ⁴⁵ *The first*
 est primus homo Adam in man Adam was made into a
 animam viventem, novissimus living soul : the last Adam into

is (as we know by experience there is) a body governed by the ψυχή, there is also (in the Divine plan) one governed by the πνεῦμα. This is to be connected closely with the preceding, as though the Apostle had written : *for* if there is a body governed by the "ψυχή," etc. It is not clear whether he is arguing that there *must* be such a body—it being wholly unreasonable to suppose that the body, the companion and servant of the soul, should always be adapted to and in harmony with only the lower functions of the soul—or simply stating the fact.

45. He proceeds to show that there are two such bodies, or kinds of bodies. For the human race has two heads ; one, who according to Genesis ii. 7, was formed with an animal body ; the other who at His resurrection received a spiritual body, and the children of each shall have a body like their parent. Hence there must remain a spiritual body for those born of Christ. Instead of "sicut scriptum est" (which the Vulgate connects with the preceding verse) we must read "sic et scriptum est"—"so also it is written"—in accordance with nearly all the evidence of Greek MSS. and versions.

Gen. ii. 7 is appealed to in support of what experience teaches, that man has a natural body animated by the ψυχή. Genesis says according to both the Hebrew and the LXX. : "and the man became a living soul." The Apostle, without changing the sense, alters the text slightly to suit his purpose by inserting "first" and "Adam," intending to speak immediately of Christ as the *last* Adam, and the *second* man (vv. 45, 47). The text means that man became a living being having a ψυχή and Gen. i. 20 ("let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature *that hath life*," תַּיִם נָפֶשׁ ; LXX. : ψυχῶν ζῶσων) and i. 24 ("let the earth bring forth *the living creature*," תַּיִם נָפֶשׁ ; LXX. : ψυχὴν ζῶσαν after its kind, cattle and creeping things, etc.") show that the same could be said of all the other animals. This ψυχή infused into the body of clay, gave it a vegetative and sensitive life, and so made it a *natural*, or *animal* body ; and of course from such a first parent only animal bodies could be inherited. Hence Genesis confirms what experience teaches, that our present body is a natural or animal body. The Apostle

Adam in spiritum vivificantem.

⁴⁶ Sed non prius quod spiritale est, sed quod animale : deinde quod spiritale. ⁴⁷ Primus homo de terra, terrenus : secundus

a quickening spirit. ⁴⁶ Yet that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural : afterwards that which is spiritual. ⁴⁷ The first man *was* of the earth, earthly : the second man, from heaven,

takes no account here of the fact that Adam's soul before the fall was adorned with habitual grace and an abundance of spiritual gifts, and hence was not only $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$, but also $\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$ (see above on ii. 13) ; and the reason he takes no account of it is that these gifts were not due to Adam's nature, moreover they were lost by his first sin, and were not transmitted to his posterity. Hence the Apostle sees in the Scriptural record only what was essential to Adam and transmitted by him to his posterity.

"The last Adam (became) a life-giving spirit" ($\pi\nu\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha$). These words are St. Paul's own, not a quotation. Christ, as another head of the race, is contrasted with the first father of mankind under the same name "Adam" ; and He is called the *last* Adam, either because He came *later* than the first, the superlative being put for the comparative (cf. 2 Tim. iii. 1 ; Matt. xii. 45 ; xxvii. 64 ; Luke xiv. 9, 10), or rather because after Him no other man shall be in any sense the father of the human race.

We saw above that "a living soul" means "a living being having a $\psi\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$ " ; so here "a life-giving spirit" means a living being having a life-giving spirit. And since Adam's soul, though merely said to be *living*, was not merely alive in itself, but also gave life to his body, when Christ's spirit is here, in contrast with it, said to be *life-giving* the meaning must be that it gives life not only to His own body, but to other bodies ; in other words, as we inherit our natural, or animal body from the first Adam, so we shall inherit our supernatural, or spiritual body from the second Adam. Christ became "a life-giving spirit" at His resurrection, when His human soul began to quicken His body with a glorified life to be shared by all the just.

46. According to the Divine plan the natural body comes first, then at the resurrection of the just, for it is of them the Apostle is speaking all along, the spiritual body succeeds.

47. "Of the earth, earthly" (R.V. "earthly"). The original has $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \gamma\eta\varsigma\ \chi\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{o}\varsigma$ after the LXX. of Gen. ii. 7 : $\chi\alpha\iota\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\nu\theta\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$ ("dust from the earth"). The first man earthly in origin ($\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\ \gamma\eta\varsigma$)

homo de coelo, coelestis. heavenly. ⁴⁸ Such as is the earthly, such also are the earthly : and such as is the heavenly, such also are they that are heavenly. ⁴⁹ Therefore as we have borne the image of

⁴⁸ Qualis terrenus, tales et terreni : et qualis coelestis, tales et coelestes. ⁴⁹ Igitur, sicut

was "made of dust" (χοῖκός; cf. Gen. iii. 19), and hence was naturally liable in his body to decay, death and corruption; for as St. Augustine says: "the body of Adam, needing meat and drink, was saved only by the tree of life from the necessity of dying, and was not a spiritual, but an animal body" (*De Civit. Dei* xiii. 23, 24).

"The second man from heaven, heavenly." "Heavenly" (Vulgate "coelestis") is wanting in Greek MSS. except F and G. Even if it be spurious, it gives the correct sense, and it must be said that we should naturally expect it here. However, that is just the reason why it may have been interpolated, while its omission in so many authorities is all the more difficult to explain. A number of authorities insert "the Lord" before "from heaven," but the weight of evidence is against the insertion. Christ is called "the second man" because He is a second Head of the race, as the Redeemer of mankind and Father of all who are saved. He is said to be "from heaven," not as though His body came from heaven, for St. Paul himself tells us that He was "made of a woman" (Gal. iv. 4), but because He was heavenly in origin, being a Divine Person begotten from eternity of the Father. He being such, His body had a title to glory and immortality from the first moment of the incarnation, but the connatural effects which would have been produced upon His body by His soul in the enjoyment of the Beatific Vision, were suspended until His resurrection, when His body actually became glorious and spiritual.

48. Such as Adam was, such also are his children, possessed of natural and animal bodies; such as is the glorious Christ, such also shall be His children, endowed with supernatural and spiritual bodies in the resurrection.

49. Instead of "therefore" (Vulgate "igitur") we must read "and" (καί) according to all the Greek MSS. It is disputed whether the verse is an exhortation, or simply a declaration of what shall take place at the resurrection; and the decision of

portavimus imaginem terreni, the earthly, let us bear also
portemus et imaginem coelestis. the image of the heavenly.

the question depends upon whether the true reading is *φορέσωμεν* ("let us bear") or *φορέσομεν* ("we shall bear"). For the former we have a great preponderance of external evidence: *κ* A C D E F G K L P, Vulg., Goth., and Copt. versions, and a large majority of the Fathers; for the latter B, the Armen., and Aeth. versions, and a few Fathers. The *external* evidence, therefore, is altogether in favour of the hortative form. The *internal* evidence, however, is rather in the other direction: (a) an exhortation here in the midst of declarations of what shall take place at the resurrection is rather abrupt and unexpected; (b) we cannot while on earth bear the image of the glorified Christ, at most we can only labour to the end that we may bear it hereafter; (c) if an exhortation were intended, we should hardly have the simple *καί* at the beginning, but instead some concluding particle like *ἀρα*. Yet the internal evidence is not all in favour of a simple declaration as to the future as against an exhortation. The previous aorist *ἐφορέσωμεν* points back more naturally to a time before baptism that is now past and gone, when we bore the image of the old Adam, and may perhaps suggest that even here on earth we may bear, in an imperfect way, the image of the glorified Christ, if we take care to remain in sanctifying grace which is the seed of glory. Certainly if the Apostle merely meant to say that as we *bear now* in our mortal bodies the image or likeness of Adam, so we shall one day bear in immortal and glorious bodies the likeness of Christ, we should expect the present *φορέσωμεν* ("we bear") rather than *ἐφορέσωμεν* ("we bore"). Perhaps, however, it may be replied to this that the aorist has here a perfect signification (we have borne—so the Revised Version), or that the Apostle is speaking from the standpoint of the resurrection and means: as we bore while on earth mortal bodies, at the resurrection we shall bear immortal bodies. On the whole, then, notwithstanding the very strong evidence for the subjunctive, the internal arguments and the great authority of B incline us to prefer the indicative with Estius, Beelen, Corluy, Drach, and the best Protestant commentators. Hence we think there is not here an exhortation, but a statement of what shall take place when our bodies are glorified at the resurrection.

⁴⁹ Hoc autem dico, fratres, quia caro et sanguis regnum Dei possidere non possunt: neque corruptio incorruptelam possidebit. ⁵¹ Ecce mysterium,

⁵⁰ Now this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God: neither shall corruption possess incorruption. ⁵¹ Behold I tell

50. The Apostle now proceeds to declare that the change of which he has been speaking from animal to spiritual bodies, is *necessary*; so necessary in fact that even those who shall be alive at the end of the world and who shall be immediately transferred to heaven, shall have to undergo it. He does not deny that the *substance* of our present bodies shall rise again; the whole context shows that he is speaking of a change in the *qualities* of the body, while supposing that the body that shall rise is the body that went into the grave (vv. 42-44). "Hoc ergo loco," says St. Augustine (ad Cons., Ep. 205), "nomine carnis et sanguinis corruptionem mortalitatis intelligi voluit." In saying, then, that "flesh and blood" cannot enter heaven, the Apostle refers to our bodies in their present corruptible state or man in his present inferior condition (cf. Matt. xvi. 17; Gal. i. 16; Eph. vi. 12; Heb. ii. 14), not to the substance of our bodies. We know in fact that Christ's risen body had flesh and bones, for He Himself said to the Apostles and those with them: "Handle Me and see, for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you behold Me to have" (Luke xxiv. 39); and St. Paul makes it clear in the present passage that the bodies of the glorified just shall be like Christ's body (cf. St. Augustine, *Retract.* i. 17; ii. 3). Nor can "flesh and blood" and "corruption" mean here the concupiscence of the flesh and moral corruption (though of course it is true that they too cannot inherit the kingdom of God), for the "corruptible" to which the Apostle refers is said in v. 53 to put on incorruption, the incorruption, too, of glory (for the Apostle is speaking only of the just), and hence "corruption" cannot refer to moral corruption, but must refer to the present corruptible and animal condition of the body.

51. The thought that our present mortal bodies cannot enter Heaven, leads the Apostle on to speak of the fate of those who shall be alive at the last day. "A mystery," i.e., something hidden and generally unknown. According to the Vulgate and our Rheims Version, this mystery is that we shall all indeed rise, but we shall not all be changed, i.e., that all men, good and bad, shall rise, but not all shall rise in glory, so as to have their bodies

vobis dico : Omnes quidem you a mystery. We shall all

changed into spiritual and glorious bodies. But where is the mystery in this ? Though the Apostle has been speaking hitherto of the resurrection of the just, the resurrection of the wicked also had been plainly foretold by Christ Himself (John v. 28, 29), and probably preached by St. Paul (Acts xvii. 18, 32), so that he can hardly mean that this is the mystery ; still less was there any mystery in the fact that all men shall not rise in glory, for every Christian knew that. Hence the Vulgate reading becomes at once suspect from the fact that it expresses no mystery. And there are also other very strong arguments against it : (a) though the common Latin reading since the time of Tertullian, it is found in no Greek MS., except the sixth-century D, in no Greek Father, in no version except the Latin and the margin of some Armenian MSS., and, in St. Jerome's time, not in all the Latin copies ; (b) it makes the Apostle refer here to the resurrection of the wicked as well as the just, whereas hitherto he has confined his attention to the just ; (c) it makes the connection of this verse with the next impossible, except we suppose that " but we shall not all be changed " is parenthetical, and connect the preceding words with " in a moment " so as to give the sense : we shall all indeed rise in a moment, etc. But had St. Paul meant this, surely he would have expressed himself differently, when he could have so easily inverted the order of the two clauses of this verse. Hence we must seek for the mystery of which the Apostle speaks, in some other reading.

There are various other readings, but only two deserve notice. One : " we shall all indeed sleep (*κοιμηθήσόμεθα*), but we shall not all be changed," has the support of \aleph C F G and MSS. known to St. Jerome, as well as of the Arm. and some MSS. of the Aeth. versions, and of a few Greek Fathers. But it is open to all the objections urged against the Vulgate reading, and, moreover, it makes the connection of this verse with the next impossible, even by means of a parenthesis. For what would be the sense of : " we shall all indeed sleep, but we shall not all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye " ?

The other, which has always, as far as is known, been the common Greek reading, is : πάντες οὐ κοιμηθήσόμεθα, πάντες δὲ ἀλλογησόμεθα : " We (Christians) shall not all sleep (die), but we shall all be changed," or : " none of us (Christians who shall be alive at the last day) shall sleep : but we shall all be changed."

resurgemus, sed non omnes im- indeed rise again : but we shall

It is supported by B E K L P among uncials, by nearly all the cursive MSS., by the Syriac, Coptic, Gothic versions, as well as by many MSS. of the Aethiopic ; it was the reading of not a few Latin MSS. in the time of St. Jerome, and it is the reading known to practically all the Greek Fathers. On the ground of external evidence, therefore, this reading is far the most probable. And internal evidence is almost more in its favour, for according to this reading (a) there is a mystery here, namely, that some shall be changed and shall put on immortality without passing through death, (b) the Apostle, as in the rest of the chapter, refers only to the just, either all the just of all times if we render : " we shall not all sleep " ; or all the just alive at the Second Coming if we render : " none of us shall sleep " ; (c) the connection with the next verse is easy and natural : " we shall not all die but we shall all be changed in a moment, etc."

We take it, then, that this is the true reading. Nor need there be difficulty about admitting an error in our Vulgate about even a dogmatic text like this, the reading of which was uncertain not only at the time of the Council of Trent but even in the days of St. Jerome. Trent, indeed, binds us to receive as sacred and canonical the sacred books with all their parts, as they were wont to be read in the Catholic Church and are contained in the Old Latin Vulgate (Sess. iv., Decr. de can. script.). But the Vulgate version of this verse was never read throughout the Catholic Church, being apparently unknown in the East, and hence even if the single verse be a " part " of Scripture in the sense intended by the Council, we are free to reject the Vulgate reading of it (Cf. Corn., *Introd. Gen.*, p. 456 ff. *Compend.*, p. 114 ff.).

The sense, then, of the most probable reading is, as we have seen, that all shall not die, that some shall escape death, these some plainly being the same with those who in the end of v. 52 are distinguished from the dead, yet said to be destined to be changed into an immortal body. Hence the mystery which the Apostle declares is that at Christ's Second Coming those then alive shall put on immortality without passing through death. So St. Paul tells the Thessalonians : " the dead in Christ shall arise first ; then we that are alive, that are left, shall be snatched up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air, and so shall we be with the Lord for ever " (1 Thess. iv. 15-16).

mutabimur. ⁴² In momento, in not all be changed. ⁵² In a ictu oculi, in novissima tuba : moment, in the twinkling of an

Estius tries to explain the common Greek reading, which he rightly prefers, in the sense that though all men must die, those alive at the last day shall not so sleep in death as to remain for a period in the grave. But κοιμᾶσθαι has no such meaning in the New Testament, where it is used simply of the death of the just (implying a rest from which there is a happy awakening). Besides there would be no mystery in the fact that those alive at the last day should not remain long in death ; everybody would take the fact for granted. Hence if the common Greek reading is correct, we must explain it as above, and hold that those alive at the last day shall be exempt from death.

But, it will be said, must not all men die ? Does not St. Paul himself tell us that " death passed to all men " through Adam's sin ? (Rom. v. 12 ; cf. v. 22 ; Heb. ix. 27). Certainly Scripture makes it clear that all men became liable to the penalty of death, but it would seem from what is by far the most probable reading of the present verse, as well as from 1 Thess. iv. 15-16, that those alive at Christ's Second Coming are to be excused from paying the penalty. St. Augustine, referring to 1 Thess. iv. 15-16, writes :—" As to the words of the Apostle, he seems to assert that at the end of the world, when the Lord comes and there is to be the resurrection of the dead, some are not to die, but found alive are suddenly to be changed to that immortality which is given also to the other saints and are to be taken up together with them in the clouds. Nor has my opinion been any other as often as I have been minded to think of these words " (*Ad Dulcit.*, q. 3). And Tertullian (*De Resurr. carn.*, 41) says that the privilege of passing to immortality not by death but by change shall be accorded those alive at the last day in compensation for the hardships of the times of Antichrist. St. Augustine on the whole inclined to the view that all men must die (but he was not acquainted with the most probable reading of the present verse), so did the Latin Fathers generally, and St. Thomas regarded this view as the " safer and more common," and Suarez as the " more probable." But the Greek Fathers take the opposite view, and the present verse and 1 Thess. iv. 15-16 seem entirely in their favour, as does also the statement of the Creeds that Christ shall judge the living and the dead.

Our interpretation supposes that St. Paul writes as if he himself

canet enim tuba, et mortui resurgent incorrupti : et nos immutabimur. ⁵³ Oportet enim corruptibile hoc induere incorruptionem : et mortale hoc induere immortalitatem. ⁵⁴ Cum autem mortale hoc inducrit immortalitatem, tunc fiet ser-

eye, at the last trumpet : for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall rise again incorruptible : and we shall be changed. ⁵³ For this corruptible must put on incorruption ; and this mortal must put on immortality. ⁵⁴ And when this mortal hath put on immortality, then shall come

might be among those who shall be changed, and therefore among those alive at the last day. But he writes in the same manner in the end of v. 52 : " and we shall be changed," and in the passage of 1 Thess. referred to. We need not on this account suppose that he believed and meant to teach that the end of the world was at hand. He must have known that the knowledge of the time of Christ's Second Coming was denied to man (Matt. xxiv. 36 ; Mark xiii. 32), and being ignorant of the time, he sometimes, as here and in 1 Thess., associates himself with those who shall be then alive ; at other times, as in vi. 14 ; 2 Cor. iv. 14, with those who shall then be raised up, and who must, therefore, have died before (cf. Eph. ii. 7 ; 2 Thess. ii. 2 ff.).

52. This, as we have pointed out already, is to be closely connected with the last clause of the preceding verse : " We shall all be changed." The wondrous change from death to life and from mortal to immortal, shall be no tedious process, but instantaneous. We need not suppose St. Paul believed that an actual trumpet shall sound. Some great signal at any rate is meant, whether the voice of Christ (John v. 28) or the voice of an archangel (1 Thess. iv. 15) or some other signal (κἄλλοςμα) from God (1 Thess. iv. 15). At the signal, those who shall have died before then shall arise and put on incorruption, and those then alive shall put on immortality without dying.

53. The necessity (ἐκ) follows from the principle enunciated in v. 50, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God. As a consequence, those who are dead must arise incorruptible, and those alive must be changed and put on immortality. " Supremus ille dies non nostri extinctionem sed commutationem affert loci " (Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* i. 49). " Dies iste, quem tamquam extremum reformidas, aeterni natalis est " (Seneca, *Ep. ad Lucil.* 102).

54. More probably both clauses of the preceding verse are to

mo, qui scriptus est : Absorpta est mors in victoria. ⁵⁵ Ubi est mors victoria tua ? ubi est mors stimulus tuus ? ⁵⁶ Stimulus autem mortis peccatum est : to pass the saying that is written : *Death is swallowed up in victory.* ⁵⁵ *O death, where is thy victory ? O death, where is thy sting ?* ⁵⁶ Now the sting of death is sin : and the strength

be repeated here : " but when this corruptible " . . . " and this mortal," etc., then shall the saying that is written become an accomplished fact. The saying is, doubtless, that of Isaiah xxv. 8, though St. Paul agrees neither with the present Massoretic text nor with the LXX. The former has : " He (Jehovah) has swallowed up death for ever " (or, " unto victory "—חַיָּה), the latter is hardly intelligible, reading κατέπιεν ὁ θάνατος λελύσας, which seems to mean, " death having prevailed swallowed up." The Apostle evidently has the Hebrew text in view, and the passive voice which he adopts (" is swallowed up ") may be got from the Hebrew by pointing the Hebrew verb with other vowel-points than those standing in the present Hebrew text. When St. Jerome wrote, there were no vowel-points in the text. " In victory," rather " unto victory " (εἰς νίκης), i.e., with permanent and everlasting victory as the result.

55. The Apostle now bursts out into a song of triumph over death, freely adapting another prophetic saying. Or it is possible that this verse is part of " the saying that is written " (v. 54), and that is to be realised at the resurrection. The words are from Osee xiii. 14, where the Hebrew has : " O death, where are thy plagues ? O Sheol (grave) where is thy destruction ? " ; and the LXX. : " O death, where is thy case (against man—or ' thy condemnatory sentence against man,' ἡ δίκη σου) ? O Hades, where is thy sting ? "

St. Paul, according to the most probable reading, has : " O death, where is thy victory ? O death, where is thy sting ? " " death " being repeated, and " victory " being mentioned before " sting." " The Apostle leaps and tramples upon the prostrate form of Death, singing loud the song of triumph " (St. Chrys.).

56. Many understand of " the sting that causes death," taking θανάτου as an objective genitive ; but better understand of the sting by which death, like a scorpion (Apoc. ix. 10), wounds us. This sting is sin (ἡ ἀμαρτία), original sin (Rom. v. 12) ; for it was only through original sin that death was able to touch man. " And the strength of sin (τῆς ἀμαρτίας) (is) the law." The

virtus vero peccati lex. ⁵⁷ Deo autem gratias, qui dedit nobis victoriam per Dominum nostrum IESUM CHRISTUM. = Itaque, fratres mei dilecti, stabiles estote, et immobiles: abundantes in opere Domini semper, scientes quod labor vester non est inanis in Domino.

of sin is the law. ⁵⁷ But thanks be to God, who hath given us the victory through our Lord JESUS CHRIST. ⁵⁸ Therefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast and unmoveable; always abounding in the work of the Lord, knowing that your labour is not vain in the Lord.

Mosaic law must be meant by ὁ νόμος, and the sense is that original sin in its consequent concupiscences was stirred up and strengthened rather than abolished by the prohibitions of the Mosaic law (Rom. vii. 8). "Virtus peccati dicitur lex, inquantum sc. per legem occasionaliter est peccatum augmentatum, et quasi ad maximum suum posse pervenit" (St. Thomas, *Summa*, ii. 1; q. 55, a 3, ad. 2). The thought of the Mosaic law enters rather abruptly here, but the Apostle wished to guard against anyone's thinking that the power of sin had been in any way broken by that famous law.

57. But what the law did not do, Jesus Christ our Lord has done. So the Apostle implies in this thanksgiving (cf. Rom. vii. 25). Instead of "hath given" we must read the present participle (διδόντι). The present may be used for the future to imply the certainty of the victory to be attained at the resurrection; or it may mean, who "is giving" us the victory, in allusion to the present triumph over sin, which is the beginning and cause of the final triumph over both sin and death in the resurrection.

58. Practical consequence of this glorious assurance. "Be steadfast"; rather: "become, prove yourselves to be, steadfast" (x. 32; xi. 1). "Knowing that your labour, etc." As knowing that a glorious resurrection awaited them, they knew that their labour was not in vain, that it was not fruitless, that it would not be void of effect. "Ostendit autem haec adhortandi formula, quam falsum sit ac delirio simile, quod docent haeretici, in bonis operibus non esse respiciendum ad retributionem mercedis a Deo propositae" (Est.). "In the Lord" is not to be connected with "labour," but either with the whole clause or with "not vain," in the sense that through Christ and what He merited their labour would be rewarded.

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The Apostle first refers to the collection which the Corinthian Christians were to make for the poor of Jerusalem (vv. 1-4); this leads on to the question of his intended visit (5-9), and this again to the thought of Timothy's visit (10-11). Then he makes an explanation in regard to Apollos (12). A short but very vigorous exhortation follows (13-14), succeeded by reference to some individual Corinthians (15-18), and the Epistle closes with salutations, a warning, and a benediction (19-24).

¹ DE collectis autem quae fiunt in sanctos, sicut ordinavi ecclesiis Galatiae, ita et vos facite. ² Per unam sabbati unusquisque vestrum apud se

¹ Now concerning the collections that are made for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, so do ye also. ² On the first day of

1. The manner in which the Apostle begins: "now concerning the collection" (τῆς λογίας) shows that the matter had been brought under the notice of the Corinthians before now, and the περί δέ κ.τ.λ. suggests that they had asked for instructions as to how the collection was to be made (cf. vii. 1, 25; viii. 1; xii. 1). In reference to this collection, see also 2 Cor. viii. ix.; Rom. xv. 26; Acts xxiv. 17. These independent passages mutually support and confirm each other, and thus afford undesigned proof of their historicity. This and other collections were organised by St. Paul in compliance with a request made of him by the other Apostles, that he should help the poor of Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 10). "The saints" are, therefore, the poor Christians of Jerusalem, as the Corinthians are supposed to know already (Rom. xv. 26). Of the collection made in Galatia we know no particulars. The term λογία or λογία, which St. Paul uses here in reference to the collection, was thought until recently not to have been used except by ecclesiastical writers, but Deissmann (*Bible Studies*, p. 142 f.) shows from papyri that it was "used in Egypt from the second century B.C. at the latest."

2. The Greek text may be rendered: "On every first day of the week, let each one of you lay by him in store whatsoever he

seponat, recondens quod ei bene placuerit : ut non, cum venero, tunc collectae fiant. ³ Cum autem praesens fuero : quos probaveritis per epistolas, hos mittam perferre gratiam vestram in Ierusalem. ⁴ Quod si dignum fuerit ut et ego eam, mecum ibunt.

the week let every one of you put apart with himself, laying up what it shall well please him ; that when I come, the collections be not then to be made. ³ And when I shall be with you ; whosoever you shall approve by letters, them will I send to carry your grace to Jerusalem. ⁴ And if it be meet that I also go, they shall go with me.

can afford, in order that when I come collections may not then be being made." The *κατά* has a distributive force ; hence "on every first day of the week." The cardinal number *πρῶτον* for *πρώτην* imitates the Hebrew use of the cardinal number for the ordinal (cf. Mark xvi. 2 ; Luke xxiv. 1 ; John xx. 1, 19 ; Acts xx. 7). The singular *σαββάτον* for "week," and not as ordinarily "the sabbath day," is rare, the plural being commonly used ; but the evidence for the singular here is decisive. It is evidently implied here (see also Acts xx. 7) that Sunday was already a sacred day for Christians, and this is the earliest evidence we have on the point, for we can hardly infer anything with certainty from the meeting of the Apostles on the first Low Sunday (John xx. 26). Apparently the title "The Lord's Day" was not yet in use, though it clearly was, when the Apocalypse was written (Apoc. i. 10). The clause which we have rendered "whatsoever he can afford" seems to mean literally "to whatsoever extent things have gone well with him." The Vulgate seems to have read *εὐδοκῶν* (to be well pleased) instead of *εὐοδοῦσθαι* (to prosper). Each one, then, is to lay past every Sunday as much as he can afford, not by contributing at the liturgical meeting to a common treasury, but by setting it aside at home (*πρὸς ἑαυτῷ*) for this purpose.

3. Connect "by (or 'with') letters" with "send" rather than with "approve." The Apostle means that he will either send commendatory letters with the delegates or he will even go himself, and they shall accompany him.

4. Many think the words "and if it be meet, etc.," mean "if the sum be large enough"—"tacite exstimulat eos ad largiorem collectam" (Est.)—and the following genitive *τοῦ* seems to favour this view, but perhaps all that is meant is "if it seem

⁵ Veniam autem ad vos, cum Macedoniam pertransiero : nam Macedoniam pertransibo. ⁶ Apud vos autem forsitan manebo, vel etiam hiemabo : ut vos me deducatis quocumque iero. ⁷ Nolo enim vos modo in transitu videre, spero enim me aliquantulum temporis manere apud vos, si Dominus per-

⁵ Now I will come to you, when I shall have passed through Macedonia. For I shall pass through Macedonia. ⁶ And with you perhaps I shall abide, or even spend the winter : that you may bring me on my way whithersoever I shall go. ⁷ For I will not see you now by the way, for I trust that I shall abide with you some time, if the

good." Even if the Apostle should go himself, as he actually did (Rom. xv. 25 ; Acts xxiv. 17), he intends to bring the delegates with him in order to guard against any possible suspicion that he might retain some of the money for his own purposes.

5. From 2 Cor. i. 16 we learn that he had previously intended to come straight to Corinth and go thence to Macedonia, and indeed the change of programme announced in the present verse was afterwards made a ground of accusation against him (2 Cor. i. 17). The pres. *διέρχουμαι* refers to the Apostle's present intention of passing through Macedonia, but does not imply that he was in Macedonia when he wrote, for he wrote from Ephesus (v. 8).

6. While he will only "pass through" Macedonia, with the Corinthians he will stay, in order that they may send him on his way, accompanied by their prayers and good wishes, and probably supplied with financial help, whithersoever he may be going. This is meant as a mark of his confidence in, and affection for, them. For *πρωτόπαιον* in the same sense in other passages, see Acts xv. 3 ; xx. 38 ; xxi. 5 ; Rom. xv. 24 ; 2 Cor. i. 16 ; Tit. iii. 13 ; 3 John 6. The indefiniteness of the last clause of the verse is intelligible, as he does not know whether he may have to go to Jerusalem or not (v. 4).

7. Now that he no longer intends to call with them on his way to Macedonia, he will not pay them merely a passing visit, but "if the Lord permit" (iv. 19 ; Rom. xiv. 32 ; James iv. 13-15) will stay some time in intercourse with them. It is not Corinth, but its Christian children that he has in mind, and the *πρός* here and in v. 6 means more than *πρὸς* or *σύν*, conveying the idea of active intercourse. This verse has been taken by many to mean that the Apostle had already paid a flying visit to Corinth, and there is no doubt that the "now" fits in well

miserit. * *Permanebo autem Ephesi usque ad Pentecosten.* * *Ostium enim mihi apertum est magnum, et evidens: et adversarii multi.*

■ *Si autem venerit Timotheus, videte ut sine timore sit apud vos: opus enim Domini operatur, sicut et ego.* ¹¹ *Ne quis ergo illum spernat: de-*

Lord permit. * But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost. * For, a great door and evident is opened unto me: and many adversaries.

¹⁰ Now if Timothy come, see that he be with you without fear, for he worketh the work of the Lord, as I also do. ¹¹ Let no man therefore despise him,

with that view (for which see on 2 Cor. xii. 14; xiii. 1), even if it does not require it.

8. Evidently he wrote from Ephesus, for *ἔμμενῶ* means: "I will stay on." It does not matter whether we read the pres. *ἔμμενῶ* with a fut. sense, or the fut. *ἔμμενῶ*. If the Epistle was written about Easter (see above on v. 8; Introd., p. xxiii), Pentecost was nearly two months ahead.

9. He will stay on, not that he has any desire to keep Pentecost at Ephesus, as he had on another occasion later on to keep it at Jerusalem (Acts xx. 16), but because there is a great and effective opportunity (for preaching the Gospel) open to him, and many adversaries to be met. The Vulgate "evidens" must represent a Greek reading *ἑρπύτης*, which, however, has no other authority. "Effective" (*ἑρπύτης*) is indeed a very peculiar adjective to apply to a door, but the Apostle is thinking of the opportunity signified by the metaphor rather than of the door. *ἑρπύς* is late Greek for *ἀνέγκται*. How strong the opposition was, we may infer from Acts xix. 23 ff.

10. Timothy had already been sent by St. Paul to Macedonia on his way to Corinth (iv. 17; Acts xix. 22), but the Apostle's language here implies that he has doubt whether Timothy may reach Corinth. This is intelligible if St. Paul expected Timothy back soon (v. 11), and had asked him to return by a certain date, for Timothy might have to spend more time than was anticipated in Macedonia. This letter was probably to go direct by sea, seeing that it is expected that it may be in Corinth before Timothy. "Without fear" seems to suggest in Timothy a timid and diffident character, unless it be, as Estius holds, that "fear" is put for what would cause fear, namely, danger and annoyance. Such annoyance might come to Timothy from Paul's adversaries among the Christians at Corinth.

11. Nearly ten years after this, Timothy was still young, and

ducite autem illum in pace, ut veniat ad me : expecto enim illum cum fratribus. ¹² De Apollo autem fratre vobis notum facio, quoniam multum rogavi eum ut veniret ad vos cum fratribus : et utique non fuit voluntas ut nunc veniret : veniet autem, cum ei vacuum fuerit.

¹³ Vigilate, state in fide, viriliter agite, et confortamini.

¹⁴ Omnia vestra in charitate fiant.

but conduct ye him on his way in peace : that he may come to me. For I look for him with the brethren. ¹² And touching *our* brother Apollo, I give you to understand, that I much entreated him to come unto you with the brethren : and indeed it was not his will at all to come at this time. But he will come when he shall have leisure.

¹³ Watch ye, stand fast in the faith, do manfully, and be strengthened. ¹⁴ Let all your things be done in charity.

Paul writes to him : " let no one despise thy youth " (1 Tim. iv. 12). It is not certain whether the last clause means that Paul and the brethren were expecting Timothy, or that Paul was expecting Timothy and the brethren. Rather the latter.

12. From Timothy, Paul passes to another of his disciples. The *περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ* seems to imply that the Corinthians had asked for another visit from Apollos (vii. 1, 25 ; viii. 1 ; xii. 1 ; xvi. 1). The eloquent Alexandrian had evidently produced a great impression on the occasion of his first visit to Corinth (i. 12 ; iii. 4-6 ; Acts xviii. 24-28). St. Paul shows here that he is not jealous of Apollos ; on the contrary, he had besought him much to pay another visit to Corinth. Apollos was " not at all " willing to go *then*, but promised to go when he should " have leisure," or rather " when the fitting time should arrive " (*σώκαιρη*). Possibly the Alexandrian refused to visit Corinth, as long as an Apollos party (i. 12 ; iii. 4-6) continued to exist there. " The brethren " referred to here were possibly the bearers of this Epistle.

13. This exhortation is apparently suggested by the thought of the party strife, of which Apollos had been in part the innocent occasion. As Christian soldiers fighting for Christ and Heaven, they must be watchful against all danger to their spiritual welfare, they must stand firm in the faith, behave like men, prove themselves (not only manly, but) mighty.

14. " What means," says St. Chrysostom, " all actions in charity ? " " It means that whether one finds fault, or commands,

¹⁵ Obsecro autem vos fratres, nostis domum Stephanæ, et Fortunati, et Achaiei : quoniam sunt primitiæ Achaiaë, et in ministerium sanctorum ordinarunt seipsos : ¹⁶ Ut et vos subditi sitis eiusmodi, et omni

¹⁵ And I beseech you, brethren, you know the house of Stephanas, and of Fortunatus, and of Achaicus, that they are the first-fruits of Achaia, and have dedicated themselves to the ministry of the saints : ¹⁶ That you also be subject to

or is commanded, or learns or teaches, all must be with charity. All the previous evils mentioned in this Epistle came about from neglect of this virtue. But for such neglect, they would not have been 'puffed up' (v. 2), they would not have said, 'I am of Paul, and I of Apollos' (i. 12). Had charity been among them, they would not have gone to be judged without (vi. 1 ; cf. v. 12), or rather they would not have had lawsuits at all (vi. 7). Had charity been there, that man would not have taken his father's wife (v. 1) ; they would not have despised the weak brethren (viii. 10, 11) ; they would not have had divisions (xi. 18, 19) ; they would not have been vain-glorious of their gifts (xii.-xiv.). Therefore, he says, 'let all things be done with charity.' " With St. Chrysostom we hold the reference here to be to fraternal charity ; and again with him and many others, against Estius and many others, we think it more likely that there is question here of a *counsel*, not a precept, to act always from a motive of charity.

15. The Apostle now passes on to speak of the Corinthian delegates, who were with him in Ephesus, and who probably were soon to return to Corinth. The best Greek MSS. omit mention of Fortunatus and Achaicus in this verse. It is, therefore, the house of Stephanas (i. 16) that is said to be the first fruits of Achaia (Greece). The words "you know the house of Stephanas, etc.," to the end of the verse, are parenthetical, and thrown in to commend the request he is about to make. Apparently neither Stephanas nor his household had been appointed by St. Paul to the service of their fellow-Christians ; they were, therefore, not in Holy Orders, but had "set themselves" to be of general service to Christians, or perhaps had undertaken to organise the collection for the poor of Jerusalem (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 4 ; ix. 1).

16. Here we have the request. It is that as such people serve all the brethren, the Corinthians in their turn (καί) should be

cooperanti et laboranti. ¹⁷ Gaudē autem in præsētia Stephanæ, et Fortunati, et Achaici : quoniam id quod vobis deerat, ipsi suppleverunt : ¹⁸ Refecerunt enim et meum spiritum, et vestrum. Cognoscite ergo qui huiusmodi sunt.

¹⁹ Salutant vos ecclesiæ Asiæ. Salutant vos in Domino multum, Aquila et Priscilla,

such, and to every one that worketh with us, and laboureth. ¹⁷ And I rejoice in the presence of Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, because that which was wanting on your part, they have supplied. ¹⁸ For they have refreshed both my spirit and yours. Know them therefore that are such.

¹⁹ The churches of Asia salute

subject to them, not indeed as to duly constituted superiors, but with the deference due to men of virtue and recognised merit. Hence he requests that the same deference be shown to everyone that co-operateth and laboureth (in the service of Christians).

17. It is commonly held that the three persons here mentioned were the bearers of the letter of the Corinthians to Paul, and of his reply, the present Epistle ; but it is quite possible that the Epistle was carried by Titus and the brother mentioned in 2 Cor. xii. 18, who would then start the collection which Titus was afterwards sent to bring to completion (2 Cor. viii. 6). Fortunatus and Achaicus are not mentioned elsewhere in the New Testament. St. Paul rejoices in their presence in (or "at their coming to") Ephesus, and he adds the reason : "because that which was wanting on your part (read τὸ ὑμέτερον ὑστέρημα) they supplied." The sense seems to be, not that they made up for the shortcomings of the Corinthians in attention to the Apostle, for it is very unlikely that St. Paul would make such a bitter remark as this just at the close of the Epistle, but that they in some manner filled the void created by the absence of the Corinthians—"they made up for your absence."

18. They refreshed the spirit (πνεῦμα) both of the Apostle, to whom they came, and of the Corinthians, from whom they came, and whom they represented. "Know," i.e., "acknowledge therefore them that are such." They have undertaken a long and perilous journey on your behalf, and given pleasure to both me and you ; such services deserve a generous recognition.

19. Here the Apostle begins the solemn conclusion of the Epistle. The collective salutations are threefold—(a) from the churches of Proconsular Asia ; (b) from Aquila and Priscilla and the church that is in their house ; (c) from the other Christians of Ephesus.

cum domestica sua ecclesia :
 apud quos et hospitor. ²⁰ Salu-
 tant vos omnes fratres. Salu-
 tate invicem in osculo sancto.
²¹ Salutatio, mea manu Pauli.

you. Aquila and Priscilla salute
 you much in the Lord, with the
 church that is in their house,
 with whom I also lodge. ²⁰ All
 the brethren salute you. Salute
 one another in a holy kiss.
²¹ The salutation of *me* Paul,

To these, with his own hand, he adds a salutation from himself, together with a parting warning and blessing.

"Asia" was the proconsular Roman province of that name, which lay along the Western coast of Asia Minor, and of which Ephesus was the capital (cf. Acts xix. 10). For Aquila and Priscilla (or Prisca), see Acts xviii. 2, 3, 18, 26 ; Rom. xvi. 3, 4 ; 2 Tim. iv. 19. From the first reference we learn that Aquila was a Jew and that Priscilla was his wife. St. Paul stayed with them on his first visit to Corinth ; and when he left, they accompanied him to Ephesus (Acts xviii. 18), where evidently they still were at this time. Later on we find them at Rome, and again with their house as a meeting-place for Christians (Rom. xvi. 3-5). It is not likely that "the church that is in their house" refers here merely to their domestic circle or, on the other hand, to the whole Christian body at Ephesus ; it rather means a certain portion of the Ephesian Christians accustomed to meet there for liturgical purposes, there being as yet probably no special sanctuaries set apart at Ephesus or indeed anywhere for Christian worship. The words "with whom I also lodge" are probably spurious.

20. "All the brethren" are the other Christians of Ephesus that did not meet at the house of Aquila and Priscilla.—"A holy kiss." The practice of kissing in the Christian assemblies was restrained at an early period (*Const. Apost.* ii. 57 ; viii. 11), if not from the very beginning, to members of the same sex. St. Chrysostom, on 2 Cor. xiii. 12, says : "We are the temple of Christ. We kiss the porch and entrance of this temple in kissing one another. . . . Through these gates also, the gates and doors of our body, Christ has entered in, and does enter in to us, whenever we communicate. Ye who partake of the Mysteries know my meaning. In no common way is our body honoured, receiving the Body of the Lord. Let them hear this who speak foul language ; let them hear who give immodest kiases, and shudder to think what a mouth they dishonour."

21. "With my own hand." The previous portion of the

²² Si quis non amat Dominum nostrum IESUM CHRISTUM, sit anathema, Maran Atha. ²³ Gratia Domini nostri IESU CHRISTI vobiscum. ²⁴ Charitas mea cum omnibus vobis in CHRISTO IESU. Amen. with my own hand. ²² If any man love not our Lord JESUS CHRIST, let him be anathema, Maran Atha. ²³ The grace of our Lord JESUS CHRIST be with you. ²⁴ My charity be with you all in CHRIST JESUS. Amen.

Epistle was evidently written by another hand, but the Apostle now takes the pen from his amanuensis, who may have been Sosthenes (i. 1). The salutation of Paul with his own hand was the sign of genuineness in every Epistle (2 Thess. iii. 17), a sign that was not unnecessary (2 Thess. ii. 2).

22. "Let him be anathema." For the meaning of anathema, see above on xii. 3. "Maran Atha" are two Aramaic words, the exact sense of which is much disputed. Some take the meaning to be: "Our Lord has come," others: "Our Lord, come," others: "Our Lord cometh." The *Didache* has the words (x. 6), also the *Apost. Constit.* (vii. 26). From the present passage and the *Didache* we consider the last view the most probable, so that the words contain a warning that Christ shall come in judgment. Why St. Paul should give this warning in Aramaic rather than Greek is not clear. Perhaps the expression had become common, like "Alleluia" with us, or it may be, as Zahn suggests (*Introd.* i., p. 288), that he wants to hint that the persons he has before his mind in this verse are Palestinian Jews.

23. The Apostle will not end without the usual beautiful benediction. Like a true teacher, says St. Chrysostom, he helps not only with counsels, but with prayers.

24. Finally, in addition to the usual benediction, he either sends his love in the form of a blessing: "my love be with you all in Christ Jesus," or assures them that it is with them all in Christ Jesus. By these last words, says St. Chrysostom, "the Apostle shows that he has written not from anger or indignation, but from the care he has for them, since after so great an accusation he does not turn away from them, but loves and esteems them." The final "amen" is possibly a liturgical addition here. The subscription, which states that the Apostle wrote from Philippi, is wanting in the best MSS. It is based, no doubt, on a misunderstanding of διέρχομαι in verse 5 of this chapter, someone concluding from the present tense there that the Apostle at the time he wrote was in Macedonia, to which Philippi belonged.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE
CORINTHIANS

INTRODUCTION TO THE SECOND EPISTLE

I. AUTHENTICITY AND INTEGRITY

1. There is hardly more need to delay upon these questions in the case of the present Epistle than in that of our First Epistle. Even if we admitted the reminiscences of it in the Apostolic Fathers to be doubtful,* its authenticity is proved to have been universally accepted before the end of the second century: in the Roman church, by the Muratorian Fragment; in the Gallican, by St. Irenaeus (*Haer.* iii. 7); in the African, by Tertullian (*Marc.* v. 12 ff.); in the Egyptian, by Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* iv. 1); in the church of Greece, by Athenagoras (*De Resurr.*, xviii.). And to this widespread evidence is to be added that of the Old Latin and Syriac Versions, made during the second century, which always contained this Epistle. Internal evidence, too, is convincingly in favour of its authenticity. "In fact, in its individuality of style, intensity of feeling, inimitable expression of the writer's idiosyncrasy, it may be said to stand at the head of all the Pauline Epistles, Galatians not excepted. Moreover, its historical references are so unstudied, so manifold, so intricate, that difficult as it is to reconstruct with any certainty the historical situation, the difficulty is rather analogous to the 'subtilitas Naturae,' than such as would result from the inconsistencies of a literary fabrication" (Robertson, in *Hastings D. B.*, i., p. 492).

2. Nor is there any really solid ground for questioning the integrity of the Epistle, although various attempts have been made to show that it consists of two or three distinct pieces written on different occasions by the Apostle, and combined after his time into one letter. Thus Semler cut it up into three pieces (I.—viii. + xiii. 11–13; x. 1—xiii. 10; ix.); others into two (I.—ix. and x.—xiii.), some of the latter maintaining that the

* But cf. *The N.T. in the Apost. Fathers*, p. 91, etc.; Funk, *Patres Apost.* I. Index loc. 22.

second piece is the painful letter of ii. 3 ; others that it is only a part of the painful letter, the rest having been lost. We will not delay here upon these vagaries, which have not a particle of early evidence in their favour—since from the earliest times, as far as we know, the Epistle circulated as one whole in all the MSS.—and which, as we shall see, are quite unnecessary to explain the form and contents of the Epistle. As to the passage vi. 14–vii. 1, which has been specially attacked as either not Pauline or not properly belonging to this Epistle, and which is certainly introduced very abruptly, see below on vi. 14.

II. HISTORICAL SITUATION, OCCASION, OBJECT, AND PLAN

1. Much has been written, especially by modern non-Catholic writers, on the historical situation and presuppositions of this Epistle (See, *e.g.*, Robertson in *Hastings D. B.*, 4 ; Menzies, *The Sec. Ep. of the Apostle Paul*, Introd., p. xvii. ff.). How many visits had St. Paul previously paid, how many letters had he previously written, to Corinth ? Did the change of mind, of which he speaks in 2 Cor. i. 15–17, take place before or after the writing of our First Corinthians ? Is the case referred to in 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff. and vii. 12 that of the incestuous sinner of our First Epistle, v. 2 ff. or is the reference in the later Epistle to an offence of a wholly different kind, a *personal* offence against St. Paul ? It will make for clearness if we devote a few words to each of these questions, before going on to speak of the occasion of the Epistle. On some of them it is impossible to speak with certainty, but we shall state briefly what we consider most probable, referring to the Commentary that follows for a further statement of our reasons.

(a) In the first place, then, we regard it as almost certain that the Apostle had paid two visits to Corinth before our present Epistle was written (see *infra* on ii. 1 ; xii. 14 ; xiii. 1, 2) ; and as more probable that the second of these two visits was paid on the return from a brief mission to Illyrium (Rom. xv. 19), undertaken either during the eighteen months' stay in Corinth (Acts xviii. 11) or, if ἐκδήσιον of Acts xviii. 11 be pressed against such an interruption of the eighteen months' stay, then at the close of that period. St. Luke's narrative in Acts (xviii. 11, 18) leaves room for such a visit, especially when we remember that

a somewhat similar narrative in Acts ix. 19-23 omits the visit of St. Paul to Arabia, which we know was actually paid (Gal. i. 17); and if the visit took place at that time, we can understand why our First Corinthians, written nearly three years after, might make no reference to it.

(b) As to the number of Epistles written to Corinth by the Apostle before the present one, there were certainly at least two: that referred to in First Cor. v. 9, and our present First Cor. itself. But was there any other? Possibly; but notwithstanding all that has been written to the contrary, we believe there is no evidence that proves it. It is urged indeed that the painful letter of 2 Cor. ii. 3, which St. Paul at one time almost regretted having written (2 Cor. vii. 8), cannot be our present First Cor. Thus Menzies (Introd., p. xviii), after mentioning two other reasons that have no weight, adds "nor, strongest reason of all, is the First Epistle to the Corinthians at all likely to have been written with tears." But anyone who remembers, on the one hand, the zeal of St. Paul and his love for his Corinthian children, and on the other, the various severe passages in our present First Epistle: iv. 18-21; v. 1, 2; vi. 8; xi. 17-22, and the abuses at Corinth which made such passages necessary, will have little difficulty in believing that the Apostle may well have written that Epistle in sorrow and tears.

(c) We take it that the Apostle's change of mind in regard to his visit to Corinth is announced in 1 Cor. xvi. 5, as indeed is fairly implied by the form of that verse with its emphatic insistence on a journey through Macedonia before he comes to Corinth: "Now I will come to you, when I shall have passed through Macedonia. For I (will) pass through Macedonia." The Apostle must have previously intended to go direct by sea to Corinth (2 Cor. i. 15, 16), and allowed that intention to become known to the Corinthians; then when in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 he announced his change of mind, he was charged with inconstancy and unreliability, and to this charge he replies in our present Epistle, i. 15 ff.

(d) With all the Fathers, both Greek and Latin,* except Tertullian (*De Pudic.*, xiii.), who refusing forgiveness to adulterers was unwilling to admit that St. Paul had pardoned the incestuous adulterer, and with all the earlier commentators, we hold it to be more probable that the reference in 2 Cor. ii. 5 ff.; vii. 12

* See Cornely on 2 Cor. ii. 4, note, p. 60.

is to the incestuous adulterer of 1 Cor. v. 1 ff., and not to someone who had given personal offence to St. Paul. That there is nothing in St. Paul's language in the present Epistle inconsistent with this view, see below on ii. 5 ff. and vii. 12.

2. We may now proceed to consider the *occasion* of the present Epistle. Before our First Epistle to the Corinthians was despatched or written (1 Cor. iv. 17), Timothy had been sent into Macedonia (Acts xix. 22), with instructions to go on to Corinth if possible (1 Cor. iv. 17; xvi. 10); but St. Paul expected the Epistle, which was apparently to go direct by sea, to arrive before him (1 Cor. xvi. 10). If Timothy ever reached Corinth on that occasion, the news he brought back may have been partially the occasion of the present Epistle. But there is doubt if he did; the silence of St. Luke in Acts is indeed no argument to the contrary (compare a similar silence in Acts ix. 20-25 regarding St. Paul's visit to Arabia, Gal. i. 17), but the fact that there is no reference to the visit in the present Epistle, and that St. Paul in 1 Cor. xvi. 10 seems to regard it as hypothetical, affords ground for doubt. On the other hand, it may be urged in favour of Timothy's having reached Corinth that if he had failed to do so after St. Paul had announced him (1 Cor. iv. 17), the Corinthians would have had another grievance, and we might fairly expect to find reference to the matter in the present Epistle.

Be this as it may, about the time that our First Corinthians was despatched, Titus was sent to Corinth (see on 1 Cor. xvi. 17), probably with instructions to start the collection for the poor of Jerusalem (2 Cor. viii. 6), but chiefly to bring back news to the Apostle of the condition of the church. Meantime, St. Paul's intention was to stay on till after Pentecost at Ephesus (1 Cor. xvi. 8), then start for Macedonia and Greece, picking up, at Troas, Titus on his return from Corinth (2 Cor. ii. 12, 13). But the disturbance created by Demetrius the silversmith (Acts xix. 23 ff.) seems to have forced the Apostle to hasten his departure from Ephesus, with the result that when he reached Troas, Titus had not arrived. It might have been expected that he would remain at Troas till Titus came, especially as a promising opportunity for the spread of the Gospel presented itself (2 Cor. ii. 12), but so great was his anxiety to meet Titus and learn the condition of the Corinthian church that, unable to find rest in his spirit, he crossed to Macedonia (2 Cor. ii. 13). There, after much suffering and anxiety, he was at length consoled by the arrival of Titus and by the good news he brought (2 Cor. vii. 5 ff.). The

Corinthians had indeed been made sorrowful by our First Epistle, but sorrowful unto repentance, so that they manifested their anxious desire to make amends, to defend the Apostle against his adversaries, to do all that he required of them, and to have him back once again among them (2 Cor. vii. 7, 11); they had also expelled the incestuous sinner from their communion and so brought about his repentance, and now apparently wanted to learn from the Apostle how they were to treat him (2 Cor. ii. 5 ff.).

But there was a darker side to the picture; Titus had to tell also of some led astray by the false apostles, the Judaizing teachers who were calumniating St. Paul and endeavouring by every means to destroy his authority and cast suspicion on his character and teaching. These false apostles had accused him of levity and fickleness for having changed his mind in regard to his visit to Corinth (2 Cor. i. 15 ff.), they had charged himself and his companions with puffing themselves and behaving arrogantly (iii. 1 ff.), they had dubbed him a coward, who when absent could frighten by strong letters, but who was weak and contemptible when present (xi. 10), they had even attempted to question the purity of his motives in preaching the Gospel gratis (xi. 6; xii. 13). Now, these tidings brought by Titus—partly consoling, partly disappointing and irritating—were the occasion of the Epistle, which vividly reflects their twofold character.

3. From what has been said, the *object* also of the Epistle is evident; on the one hand, the Apostle rejoiced at the repentance, and zeal, and affection of the Corinthians, and desired to tell them so; on the other, he deemed it advisable, before visiting them a third time, to write another letter, refuting the calumnies uttered against him, and denouncing the false teachers who sought to supplant him. At the same time he availed of the opportunity to urge on the collection for the poor of Jerusalem, about which he had already given instruction in First Corinthians xvi. 1 ff.

4. The *plan* embraces, besides the introduction and conclusion, three parts: the first *apologetic*, the second *hortatory*, the third *polemical*. In the first part, he refutes the charge of levity and fickleness made against himself, and that of self-laudation and arrogance made against himself and his companions; then sets forth at some length the hard conditions of their life, and the pure and lofty motives by which they were inspired. In the second, he exhorts and stimulates the Corinthians to give generously

and joyfully to the collection for the poor of Jerusalem, at the same time recommending to them his legates who are to superintend the completion of the collection. In the third, he asserts his Apostolic authority, shows his superiority to the false teachers, who calumniated him, and excuses his glorying on the ground that it is necessary for the sake of the Corinthians.

The plan may therefore be represented as follows:—

Introduction (i. 1–14)—intended to conciliate them and prepare the way for his apology—containing salutation, thanksgiving, protestation of zeal for the Corinthians, suggestion that they should pray for him, and a reminder of his general sincerity.

First Part (i. 15–vii. 16), apologetic, and containing:—

- (a) a refutation of the charge of levity and inconstancy brought against himself, and an explanation of the change of mind in regard to his visit to Corinth, on which the charge was chiefly based (i. 15–ii. 4). As he had postponed his visit to the Corinthians to avoid sorrow to himself and them, this suggests mention of one great cause of sorrow, the incestuous Corinthian (ii. 5–11). The section closes with evidence of his interest in them, a thanksgiving, and a hit at the false teachers (ii. 12–17).
- (b) a refutation of the charge of self-laudation and arrogance brought against himself and his companions, which is met by showing that they needed no commendation (iii. 1–3), and that their confidence, which some deemed arrogance, was due to the grace of Christ and to the glorious character of the Gospel they preached. They had nothing to hide, and if the Gospel was hidden from some, it was their own fault (iii. 4–iv. 6).
- (c) an account of their hard life of bitter trial, borne for the sake of the Corinthians, in the hope of a glorious resurrection and of being at home in Heaven with Christ (iv. 7–v. 8), whose judgment they fear and whose charity impels them, so that by God's mercy they are now new beings (v. 9–19). As Christ's ambassadors, they give offence to no one and bear all sorts of trials joyfully (v. 20–vi. 10); their hearts go out to the Corinthians, who ought to return love for love and prove it by deeds (vi. 11–18). The apology closes with exhortation and renewed evidence of interest and affection (vii. 1–16).

Second Part (viii. 1–ix. 15), hortatory regarding the collection, and embracing :—

- (a) reference to the example of the Macedonians in the matter (viii. 1–5).
- (b) exhortation to give generously according to their means (viii. 6–15).
- (c) commendation of those who were to superintend the completion of the collection (viii. 16–ix. 5).
- (d) renewed exhortation to give generously and joyfully (ix. 6–15).

Third Part (x. 1–xiii. 10) polemical, and containing :—

- (a) an assertion of his Apostolic authority, and a threat that he will prove it, if provoked (x. 1–18).
- (b) a claim of superiority to the false teachers, as evidenced by his knowledge, his refusal to accept support from the Corinthians, his tribulations endured for the Gospel, and the favours bestowed on him by God (xi. 1–xii. 10).
- (c) an apology for his boasting, in which he explains that his purpose is to prepare by this Epistle or polemical section the way for his visit, so that he may not again be humbled among them, and be forced to display his authority (xii. 11–xiii. 10).

Conclusion (xiii. 11–13) containing brief exhortation, salutation, and a most solemn benediction.

III. PLACE AND DATE

1. It is generally agreed that this Epistle was written in Macedonia (cf. ii. 13 ; viii. 1 ; ix. 2, 4) ; but whether at Philippi, as the subscriptions of many MSS. attest, or in some other church of Macedonia, we cannot be quite certain.

2. The *date* of the Epistle depends largely on the date of our First Corinthians, for which see the Introduction to that Epistle iv. 2, pp. xxii, xxiii. If First Corinthians was written, as we think most probable, in the Spring of 55 A.D., the present Epistle must have followed about the commencement of Autumn of the same year. For, as has been seen in the preceding section, the Apostle had to leave Ephesus soon after writing our First Corinthians, and then came on to Macedonia. Before writing the present

Epistle, he must have spent some months in Macedonia, if we may judge from his sufferings there (2 Cor. vii. 5), and especially from the fact that he had finished the collection for the poor of Jerusalem (viii. 1 ff.), which was probably made in the manner directed for Corinth (1 Cor. xvi. 2), by setting aside small sums each Sabbath. But not more than a few months can have elapsed, for, on the one hand, we have no reason for thinking that the return of Titus was longer delayed; and, on the other, the arrival of Titus and the news he brought were evidently still fresh in the Apostle's mind when he wrote (vii. 5 ff.). Moreover, from Acts xx. 2, 3, 6 we gather that St. Paul must have arrived in Corinth upon this occasion about November, seeing that after a three months' stay there he was again back at Philippi for the Pasch of the following year; and if we suppose the present Epistle to have been written two months or so before his arrival in November, in order to allow time for Titus to complete the collection in the meantime (ix. 3-5), we must come to the conclusion that the most probable date of the Epistle is about September, 55 A.D.

IV. GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS, STYLE, AND VOCABULARY

1. One marked characteristic of this Epistle is the great variety of feelings which succeed one another in it in rapid succession. "Joy and depression, anxiety and hope, trust and resentment, anger and love, follow one another, the one as intense as the other. Yet there is no touch of vacillation, nor any contradiction. The circumstances dictate and justify it all, and he is master of it all, the same throughout, and always his whole self. An extraordinary susceptibility of feeling and impression, such as only an extraordinary character can hold in control" (Weizsäcker, *Apost. Zitter*, p. 328).

We see his ardent love for Jesus Christ, his sense of personal weakness, his pride in his Apostolic ministry, his contempt of temporal sufferings, his faith in the eternal, his anxiety for the poor, his tender love for his spiritual children, his burning indignation with those who sought to corrupt them, his withering sarcasm, his fearless courage, his melting compassion.

This is the most personal of all St. Paul's writings, giving us, more than any other epistle, an insight into his character, the

sufferings he endured for the Gospel, and the favours God bestowed upon him, so that it has been called his "Apologia." The glimpse of his sufferings and hardships afforded in xi. 24 ff., and of the marvellous Divine favours bestowed upon him disclosed in xii. 2 ff., is a most valuable contribution towards a just appreciation of the Apostle's life and labours.

Another feature of the Epistle is the remarkable manner in which the Apostle blends with personal details broader considerations, and even dogmatic points of the greatest importance. Thus, in refuting the charge of arrogance, he teaches us the superior glory of the New Dispensation (iii.); in describing the sufferings of the ministers of the Gospel, he turns to the glory of the future life and the hoped-for resurrection of the body (iv., v.); and in exhorting to the collection for the poor, he teaches the doctrine of the Incarnation (viii. 9).

2. The *style* of the Epistle is as varied as the feelings it expresses. Referring to the variety of thought and style, Erasmus, in a passage that would be spoiled by translation, writes : "Nunc ut limpidae fons sensim ebullit, mox torrentis in morem ingenti fragore devolvitur, multa obiter secum rapiens, nunc placide leniterque fluit, nunc late velut in lacum effusus exspatiatur; rursum alicubi se condit atque diverso loco subitus emicat, quum visum est; miris Maeandris nunc has nunc illas lambit ripas, aliquoties procul digressus reciproco flexu in sese redit" (*Paraphr. Dedic.*). And elsewhere (in note on vi. 13) the same great stylist says : "Sic totus hic sermo per contraria, per membra, per comparia, per similiter desinentia, per ἀνορθώσεως aliaque id genus schemata variatur, volvitur ac rotatur, ut nihil esse possit nec venustius nec ardentius." And St. Augustine (*Doctr. Christ* iv. 12 ff.) compares our Epistle in rhetorical art with the famous oration of Demosthenes "On the Crown."

The style of the last four chapters is particularly vehement and polemical, so much so indeed that many non-Catholic scholars have suggested as an explanation of the difference in style between them and the rest of the Epistle that they form part or the whole of a different letter, or that they must have been written some time after the rest of the Epistle on an occasion when the Apostle had received specially bad news from Corinth. But there is no need to resort to any such explanation. Glimpses of warm and indignant feeling are not wanting in other portions of the Epistle (i. 17, 18, 23; ii. 17; iii. 1; iv. 2, 5; v. 12; vii. 2); and the difference of style is sufficiently explained by the difference of

subject, and by the fact that the Apostle reserved for the close, until he had set himself right with the great body of the Corinthian church, the open and fierce denunciation of his opponents. As Conyb.—Howe., p. 439, write: "The twofold character of this Epistle is easily explained by the existence of the majority and minority which we have described in the Corinthian church. Towards the former the Epistle overflows with love; towards the latter it abounds with warning and menace. The purpose of the Apostle was to encourage and tranquillise the great body of the church; but, at the same time, he was constrained to maintain his authority against those who persisted in despising the commands of Christ delivered by his mouth. It was needful also that he should notice their false accusations; and that (undeterred by the charge of vanity which they brought), he should vindicate his Apostolic character by a statement of facts, and a threat of punishment to be inflicted on the contumacious."

3. The *vocabulary* is the ordinary Pauline vocabulary, embracing even words met with in no other writer before him, but found elsewhere in his writings, such as προεπαγγέλλω, ὑπερ-περισσεύω, ψευδόδελφος, etc. There are altogether 92 ἄπαξ λεγόμενα, or words found nowhere else in the New Testament (cf. Jacq., *Hist. des Livres du N.T.*, i., p. 166).

V. QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT

There are comparatively few quotations from the Old Testament in this Epistle. What was said on this subject in the Introduction to First Corinthians (p. xxvi) holds good substantially here also. Several of the quotations are in agreement with the Septuagint, one or two approach nearer to the Hebrew, and a few, being very free, diverge considerably in form from both. Very probably the Apostle was in every instance quoting from memory.

VI. AUTHORITIES FOR THE TEXT

The text of the present Epistle is preserved in the same MSS. and versions which contain the preceding Epistle (see Introd. to 1 Cor., pp. xxvi-xxix), with the following main exceptions:—A wants iv. 13-xii. 7; C ends at x. 8; F. G. K. contain the entire Epistle; P has the entire Epistle except ii. 13-16. The Old Latin *r* contains something more than half the Epistle.

VII. COMMENTARIES

Practically the same Catholic authors have commented on this and on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. See Introd. to that Epistle, p. xxix. A good list of them may be seen in Cornely's Introd. to either Epistle. Non-Catholic English commentators on this Epistle are not so numerous as on First Corinthians, but there are still many. We may mention besides Alford (6th ed., 1871), and Stanley (4th ed., 1876), Waite (in *Speaker's Comm.*, 1881); Beet (1885); Kay (1887); Denney (in *Expositor's Bible*, 1894), and Menzies (1912). Conybeare and Howson's *Life and Epistles of St. Paul* and Zahn's *Introduction to the New Testament* again deserve special mention.

SECOND EPISTLE OF ST. PAUL TO THE CORINTHIANS

CHAPTER I

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The exordium (vv. 1-14) opens with a salutation (1-2) ; to which succeeds a thanksgiving to God (3-5). Then he points out that both the tribulations and the comfort of himself and Timothy were meant for the comfort and salvation of the Corinthians (6-7). Next, to encourage them, he alludes to the magnitude of a tribulation from which he and Timothy had been delivered by God, and expresses hope that with the aid of the prayers of the Corinthians similar deliverance awaits them in the future (8-11). The ground of this hope and confidence lies in the consciousness that they had behaved everywhere, and especially at Corinth, with candour and simplicity (12), a candour evident even in the present letter (13a) ; so he hopes that they will fully acknowledge their teachers (13b-14). The apologetic section of the Epistle (i. 15-vii. 16), to which 12-14 lead up naturally, now opens with a reference to a change of plan in regard to a projected visit to Corinth, upon which change his adversaries had founded a general charge against him of fickleness and unreliableness (15-17). He first takes up the general charge, and pointing to the fidelity of God whom they served, and of Jesus Christ whom they had preached and through whom God's Messianic promises had been fulfilled (18-20), urges that this faithful God has confirmed and anointed and sealed them as ministers of the faithful Christ. Hence they too ought to be regarded as faithful to their promises, not fickle or unreliable (21-22). Finally he begins to explain the change of plan (23).

¹ PAULUS apostolus IESU ¹ PAUL an apostle of JESUS
CHRISTI per voluntatem Dei, CHRIST by the will of God, and

1. The present inscription differs little from that in the preceding Epistle. See above on 1 Cor. i. 1-2. Instead of Sosthenes (1 Cor. i. 1), St. Paul now associates Timothy with himself in

et Timotheus frater, ecclesiae Dei quae est Corinthi, cum omnibus sanctis qui sunt in universa Achaia. ² Gratia vobis et pax a Deo Patre nostro, et Domino IESU CHRISTO.

³ Benedictus Deus et Pater Domini nostri IESU CHRISTI,

Timothy our brother : to the Church of God that is at Corinth, with all the saints that are in all Achaia : ² Grace unto you and peace from God our Father, and from the Lord JESUS CHRIST.

³ Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, the Father of mercies,

sending this letter, the title of brother given to Timothy implying not only a common faith, but also association in the same work of preaching the Gospel (cf. 1 Cor. xvi. 10 ; Rom. xvi. 21). Timothy is similarly associated with St. Paul in five other epistles : Phil., Col., 1 and 2 Thess., and Philem. Like the previous epistle, the present is addressed not merely to the church of Corinth, but to all the churches of the Roman Province of Achaia ; all were probably in much the same condition as that of Corinth and would benefit by the same instruction. Achaia, or Greece was at this time a Roman Province, separate from Macedonia (cf. ix. 2 ; Acts xx. 1-2 ; 1 Thess. i. 8), and governed by a Roman proconsul, whose ordinary place of residence was Corinth (cf. Acts xviii. 12).

2. See on 1 Cor. i. 3, where the very same words occur.

3. He begins by blessing, i.e., thanking and praising God for the comfort granted continually (this seems to be the force of the pres. part. ὁ παρακαλῶν in verse 4) to himself and Timothy, and perhaps other fellow-labourers. It is the First Person of the Blessed Trinity that is here referred to ; as He is the source of Deity and the author and sender of our Redeemer, mercy and comfort are here, as in Eph. i. 3, appropriated to Him. The absence of the article before Πατήρ shows that in ὁ Θεὸς καὶ Πατήρ the same subject is intended, so that we cannot take ὁ Θεὸς of the Blessed Trinity, and Πατήρ of the First Person ; both refer to the First Divine Person. Nor need we have any scruple about speaking of the Father as the God of Our Lord Jesus Christ, for St. Paul uses this expression in Eph. i. 17, and Christ Himself said to Magdalen : " I ascend to my Father and your Father, my God and your God " (John xx. 17).

" Father of mercies " is a Hebraistic and emphatic form for merciful Father. " All comfort " might rather be " every comfort " ; for πᾶς when not followed by the article is distributive.

pater misericordiarum, et Deus totius consolationis, ⁴ Qui consolatur nos in omni tribulatione nostra : ut possimus et ipsi consolari eos qui in omni pressura sunt, per exhortationem qua

and the God of all comfort. ⁴ Who comforteth us in all our tribulation ; that we also may be able to comfort them who are in all distress, by the exhortation wherewith we also

Thus πᾶσα πόλις means every city ; but πᾶσα ἡ πόλις, the whole city (cf. Winer-Moult., xviii. 4).

4. The twice recurring "et" in the Vulgate text of this verse is not represented in the original, but helps to set forth the sense. The Vulgate, again followed by our English version, is less happy here and in verse 6 in rendering παρακαλεῖν and παρακαλεῖσιν sometimes by "consolari" and "consolatio," sometimes by "exhortari" and "exhortatio." The words are indeed used in both senses, but the present context makes it clear that the former is intended here. Similarly the change in the rendering of θλίψις from "tribulatio" to "pressura," a change also followed of course by our English version, which is a translation of the Vulgate, does not conduce to clearness. Better to render consistently by "comfort" in the one case, and by "tribulation" in the other.

Ἐπὶ πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει means in the whole of our tribulation, i.e., throughout our tribulation, the tribulation of the Apostle and his companions being thus represented, as a continuous whole, God being a continuous comforter (ὁ παρακαλῶν) throughout. And this comfort, the Apostle says, was given them to the end that they might be able to comfort those who were in every (any kind of) tribulation, through the comfort wherewith they were themselves comforted by God. St. Paul and his fellow-workers received from God this grace of comfort, like many other special graces, in order that they might be able to discharge their ministry more effectually. We say *St. Paul and his fellow-workers*, because although the Apostle might use the first person plural of himself alone, yet in view of the inscription (verse 1), where he joins Timothy with himself, of verse 19, where the plural refers to himself and Silvanus and Timothy, and from the fact that in vv. 15, 17, 23 he uses the first person singular when speaking only for himself, it seems clear that the first person plural is not used here, if indeed it be used anywhere in the Epistle, of himself alone. "Throughout the letter, except where the general nature of the statements made render it clear that all Christians or all

exhortamur et ipsi a Deo.
 " Quoniam sicut abundant pas-
 siones Christi in nobis: ita
 et per Christum abundat
 consolatio nostra. " Sive autem
 tribulamur pro vestra exhor-
 tatione et salute, sive con-
 solamur pro vestra con-
 solatione, sive exhortamur pro
 vestra exhortatione et salute,

are exhorted by God. " For as
 the sufferings of Christ abound
 in us: so also by Christ doth
 our comfort abound. " Now
 whether we be in tribulation,
 it is for your exhortation and
 salvation: or whether we be
 comforted, it is for your con-
 solation: or whether we be
 exhorted, it is for your ex-

like-minded preachers of the Gospel are meant, the " we " includes primarily and certainly Timothy and Paul. This is true even of the concluding section, chaps. x-xiii., where, notwithstanding the fact that the introductory *αὐτὸς δὲ ἐγὼ Παῦλος* indicates that what follows is an expression of Paul's own opinion, in distinction from the joint communication of Timothy and Paul that precedes, we have an occasional substitution of ' we ' for ' I ' " (Zahn, *Introd.*, i., p. 307).

5. " The sufferings of Christ " (cf. Col. i. 24) can hardly mean merely sufferings borne for Christ's sake, as Estius and others understand, for this mode of resolving the genitive seems inadmissible.* Rather the sufferings are said to be Christ's, because He endures them in His mystical body, the Church or, better still, they are said to be His, because they are such as His; they are His sufferings continued in His followers—" *perpassiones quales perpassus est Christus* " (Beel., *Gramm. Graec. N.T.*, p. 192), and abounding especially unto (*εἰς*) St. Paul and his fellow-workers (cf. Phil. iii. 10).

6. The text of this verse is uncertain, but in all the readings the main sense is that the tribulations and comfort of the Apostle and his companions are for the good of the Corinthians. Their tribulations would teach them how to minister to the Corinthians in tribulation, and the latter would be fortified by the knowledge that their teachers had patiently trodden the way of sorrow before them; while the comfort vouchsafed by God to the teachers would help them to comfort their disciples, and also be to the latter a motive of courage and hope that they too should be comforted.

Of the two principal Greek readings one may be rendered: " But whether we be in tribulation, it is for your comfort and

* Cf. Winer-Moulton, *Gramm. of N.T. Greek*, p. 236.

quae operatur tolerantiam earundem passionum, quas et nos patimur : ' Ut spes nostra firma sit pro vobis : scientes quod sicut socii passionum

hortation and salvation, which worketh the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer. ' That our hope for you may be steadfast : knowing that as you are partakers of

salvation, which is wrought out (τῆς ἐσπάρουμένης referring here apparently to "salvation" and used in a passive sense) in endurance of the same sufferings that we also suffer, and our hope for you is steadfast (this last clause being inserted here instead of in verse 7) ; or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, knowing that . . . (as in verse 7)." This reading is supported by B (which however omits "and salvation" in the first clause, but inserts it after "your comfort" in the last) D E F G K L, some cursives and FF., and some MSS. of the Syriac.

The other and somewhat better supported reading may be rendered : "But whether we be in tribulation, it is for your comfort and salvation, or whether we be comforted, it is for your comfort, which operates (τῆς ἐσπάρουμένης referring here to "comfort," and used apparently in the middle voice, cf. Winer-Moulton, p. 323 ; *Grimm sub voce*) in endurance of the same sufferings that we also suffer ; and our hope for you is steadfast, knowing that, etc." So K A C M P, It., Vulg., most Syr., Copt., Eth.

It will be seen that our Clementine Vulgate approaches nearer to the second and better supported reading. But in the light of either reading, our Latin needs correction in several points. (a) The first "exhortatione" must be altered into "consolatione" ; (b) the clause "sive exhortamur" . . . must be omitted because wanting in the Greek MSS., and being evidently a second and mistaken rendering of the clause immediately preceding ; (c) "quae operatur tolerantiam" ought to be "quae operatur per tolerantiam."

7. In the Latin text of this verse, the clause "ut spes nostra firma sit" should be "*et spes nostra firma est*," and of course a corresponding correction is needed in our English version. We have seen that this clause is transferred by many authorities to the middle of the preceding verse, but the evidence, external and internal, is rather in favour of placing it here. No doubt the construction : "And our hope for you is firm, knowing that,

estis, sic eritis et consolationis.
 8 Non enim volumus ignorare
 vos fratres de tribulatione
 nostra quae facta est in Asia,
 quoniam supra modum gravati
 sumus supra virtutem, ita ut
 taederet nos etiam vivere.

the sufferings, so shall you be
 also of the consolation. 8 For
 we would not have you
 ignorant, brethren, of our
 tribulation, which came to us
 in Asia, that we were pressed
 out of measure above our
 strength, so that we were

etc.," is peculiar, the participle "knowing" having no expressed antecedent, but then St. Paul often attends more to sense than to the niceties of grammar. The comfort which he knows will come to the Corinthians is not that of the life to come, for the blessed shall need no comfort since they shall endure no tribulation, but comfort during their earthly life, such as had already been vouchsafed to himself and Timothy. The Greek has no verb in the last clause of this verse, but the Latin "eritis" and the English "shall be," rightly complete the sense.

8. To encourage the Corinthians, the Apostle now refers to a striking instance, and a *definite* one (such seems to be the force of the aorists), of help and comfort accorded to him and Timothy in very great tribulation. The words seem to imply that the Corinthians had heard something already of the tribulation, perhaps through Timothy or Titus, but that they were unaware of its gravity. What the tribulation was, and where in Asia it befel, we cannot say. It was hardly the tumult of the silversmiths at Ephesus (Acts xix. 23 ff.), for Timothy was absent when this occurred (Acts xix. 22), and besides if the reference were to this, we should expect Ephesus to be named rather than Asia.—The phrases "out of measure," "above our strength" (the more probable order of the words is : καθ' ὑπερβ., ὑπὲρ δυν., ἐπαρήθημεν), are taken by some to indicate respectively the magnitude of the tribulation absolutely and relatively—it was very great in itself, and it was also above the strength of Paul and his companions. Others prefer to combine the phrases, making the former qualify the latter, in the sense of "exceedingly above our strength." In the better supported Greek reading the verb ἐπαρήθημεν does not separate the two phrases but follows them. The words of the next verse : "that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God," show that there is question only of natural strength, and hence there is no contradiction with 1 Cor. x. 13 : "God is faithful, who will not suffer you to be tempted above

⁹ Sed ipsi in nobismetipsis responsum mortis habuimus, ut non simus fidentes in nobis, sed in Deo, qui suscitavit mortuos : ¹⁰ Qui de tantis periculis nos eripuit, et eruit : in quem speramus quoniam et adhuc eripiet. ¹¹ Adiuvantibus et vobis in oratione pro nobis : ut ex multorum personis, eius

weary even of life. ⁹ But we had in ourselves the answer of death, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead, ¹⁰ Who hath delivered and doth deliver us out of so great dangers : in whom we trust that He will yet also deliver us. ¹¹ You helping withal in prayer for us :

that which you are able."—The last clause of the verse means in the original : "so that we despaired even of life."

9. "Sed" of the Vulgate ought to be "imo" or "quin imo" (cf. Grimm on ὁλλᾶ, 5), and the meaning is : "Yea, we had in ourselves, etc." "What," asks St. Chrysostom, "is the answer of death? The sentence, the judgment, the expectation; for such was the voice of facts, such the answer returned by circumstances, that we should certainly die." The perfect, "have had" seems to imply that the incident, though transitory in itself, had a permanent effect upon SS. Paul and Timothy, so that since then they regarded themselves as exposed to death. We may suppose that in the light of that terrible experience, whatever it was, they considered themselves likely to be followed and murdered. The closing words of the verse hint that the dangers were so great that deliverance from them was like resurrection from the dead; they suggest, too, that He who can recall men to life, can *a fortiori* preserve them from death, even amidst the greatest dangers.

10. Instead of "so great dangers," we must read either "so great a death" or "so great deaths." It is of course dangers that are meant, but the original puts this in a most striking way. For "eruit" of Vulg. read "eripit," for the same Greek verb is used as immediately before and after, only now in the present tense. The perfect ἐλπίζομεν is rightly rendered by "we hope," for ἐλπίζειν often means to set one's hope in anything, and so the perf. comes to mean : to have it set there, or to rest in hope (cf. John v. 45; 1 Cor. xv. 19; 1 Tim. iv. 10).

11. The Apostle's hope of continued deliverance expressed in the last words of the preceding verse, is now shown to be based partly upon the supplication (δεήσαι) of the Corinthians to God in his behalf, while they co-operate (συνπορεύ.) with himself and others in prayer for his deliverance.

quae in nobis est donationis, that for this gift obtained for
per multos gratiae agantur pro us, by the means of many
nobis. ¹² Nam gloria nostra persons, thanks may be given
haec est, testimonium con- by many in our behalf. ¹² For
scientiae nostrae, quod in our glory is this, the testimony

Very many weighty authorities hold that πρόσωπον must be understood in this verse, and indeed everywhere throughout the the Bible, in the sense, not of "person," but of "face," and they take the sense here to be "that from many (grateful) faces thanks may be given, etc." It is not denied that in later Greek πρόσωπον often had the sense of "person," but it is contended that there is no clear instance of its use in that sense in the Bible. It matters nothing to the substantial meaning whether we take πρόσωπον here to mean "persons" or "faces," but we confess we have difficulty about accepting the sense "faces," because the mention of faces in the context is wholly unnecessary, and, besides, while it would be *grateful* faces that would be meant, the adjective, in which all the point would lie, is wanting. We hope the papyri may prove that the word had the sense of "person" even in St. Paul's time.

Are both ἐκ πολλῶν προσώπων and διὰ πολλῶν to be connected with the verb εὐχαριστήσῃ, or is the former only to be taken with the verb, the latter with τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρις? In the former construction we get the sense: that from many persons (or faces) thanks may be returned by many on our behalf for the gift bestowed upon us. In the latter the sense is: that from many persons thanks may be returned on our behalf for the gift obtained for us through many. This latter is natural, and avoids the redundancy ("from many—by many") of the other view. Nor is it any serious objection to this view that it would require the article after χάρισμα (τὸ εἰς ἡμᾶς χάρισμα τὸ διὰ πολλῶν), for St. Paul sometimes omits the article in similar cases; Rom. vi. 4; 1 Cor. x. 18; Eph. iii. 4, etc.

The verse shows that one reason why the Apostle wishes many to supplicate for his deliverance, is in order that many may afterwards thank God for the gift when obtained; widespread supplication would lead to widespread thanksgiving afterwards, and so God would be more honoured. The united prayers of many have a special efficacy, and hence the liturgical prayers offered in the name of the Church are peculiarly excellent.

12. Here he gives the reason for the confidence he has just

simplicitate cordis et sinceritate Dei, et non in sapientia carnali, sed in gratia Dei, conversati sumus in hoc mundo : abundan-

of our conscience, that in simplicity of heart and sincerity of God, and not in carnal wisdom, but in the grace of God, we have conversed in this world : and more abundantly

expressed of deliverance through the help of their prayers ; it is founded upon the consciousness that he and his companions had behaved worthily as apostles of Christ, and more especially towards the Corinthians. In this way he passes naturally to the apologetic portion of the Epistle.

We may render with the Rheims version : " For our glory (i.e., matter for glorying) is this," and then take the words that follow as standing in apposition to the predicate " this." But since *καύχησις* is properly the act of glorying, and not the matter wherein one glories (cf. vii. 4, 14 ; xi. 10, 17 ; 1 Cor. xv. 31 ; Rom. iii. 27, etc.), it appears better to take the meaning to be : For this glorying of ours (alluding to the confidence he has just expressed) is the result of the testimony of our conscience, that in simplicity, etc. In this view *αὐτῇ* is not the predicate, but part of the subject : " this glorying of ours " (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 9), and " testimony " is put by metonymy for that which results from the testimony.

Instead of " in simplicity of heart and sincerity of God," the best Greek MSS. read " in holiness (*ἀγιότητι*) and sincerity of God." But the Greek MSS. are opposed here by the Old Latin and the Syriac as well as by the Vulgate, and it is quite probable that the easy change from *ἀπλότης* to *ἀγιότης* was made by some early scribe who was puzzled by the idea " simplicity of God." *Θεοῦ* in the case is the genitive of origin, and both the preceding nouns are to be connected with it ; simplicity (omit " of heart ") and sincerity that come from God (and are therefore genuine) but like " the justice of God," Rom. i. 17, reside in man.—" Not in carnal wisdom "—omit the conjunction which stands at the beginning of this clause in the Vulg. and Rheims versions. " Carnal wisdom " cannot mean here profane knowledge or eloquence, for the Apostle is speaking not of the character of his preaching, but of his general behaviour ; since it seems to be opposed to simplicity and sincerity, as well as to the grace of God, we may take it to denote the ways of corrupt human nature, and especially in this context duplicity and hypocrisy. It was

tius autem ad vos. ¹² Non enim alia scribimus vobis, quam quae legistis et cognovistis. Spero autem quod usque in finem cognoscetis, ¹⁴ Sicut et cognovistis nos ex parte, quod gloria vestra sumus, sicut et vos nostra, in die Domini nostri Iesu Christi.

towards you. ¹² For we write no other things to you, than what you have read and known. And I hope that you shall know unto the end : ¹⁴ As also you have known us in part, that we are your glory, as you also are ours in the day of our Lord JESUS CHRIST.

not in such ways, "but in the grace of God," i.e., in obedience to God's grace, that Paul and Timothy behaved in the world generally, and more especially among the Corinthians. During a long stay at Corinth (Acts xviii. 11) they were able to give not only more numerous proofs of their simplicity and sincerity, but also a peculiar and very remarkable proof in the fact that they accepted no remuneration (xi. 7, 9 ; 1 Cor. ix. 1-15).

13. Instead of "you have read and known" (Vulg., "legistis et cognovistis"), the best Greek reading has : "ye *do* read or even know" (ἐπιγινώσκετε "know well" or "acknowledge" or "recognise").

Neither the drift nor the meaning of the verse is clear. Estius takes the meaning to be : for in what we have just written of our simplicity and sincerity we are writing nothing but what you yourselves *remember* and know well. But against this is the fact that ἐπιγινώσκω is used more than thirty times in the New Testament and always in the sense of "to read." Retaining this sense then, as we must, some take the Apostle to be answering a charge that his letters did not say what he meant, that they concealed his real mind, and these understand the sense to be : for we do not write to you in our letters anything but what you read (on the surface of them) or even recognise (at a glance). So Zahn, *Introd.* i., p. 322. Others think that he is arguing in favour of his simplicity and candour from the consistency of his teaching : for we write no other things to you (in this present letter) than what you do read in our former letters (two of which : our present First Epistle to the Corinthians, and that referred to in 1 Cor. v. 9, were probably in their possession and read every Sunday) and acknowledge.

14. Some connect the remaining words of verse 13 : "and I hope, etc.," with what has gone before, in the sense : I hope you will acknowledge to the end what you read in our letters

¹⁵ Et hac confidentia volui prius venire ad vos, ut secundam gratiam haberetis:

¹⁶ Et per vos transire in Macedoniam, et iterum a Macedonia venire ad vos, et a vobis deduci in Iudaeam.

¹⁷ Cum ergo hoc voluissem, numquid levitate usus sum?

¹⁵ And in this confidence I had a mind to come to you before, that you might have a second grace: ¹⁶ And to pass by you into Macedonia, and again from Macedonia to come to you, and by you to be brought on my way towards Judea. ¹⁷ Whereas then I was thus minded, did I use lightness? Or the things that I

and acknowledge. We prefer to connect them with what follows, and we would begin a new verse with them. From speaking of their acknowledging what he writes, the Apostle passes on to speak of their acknowledging himself: And I hope that you will acknowledge fully or perfectly (ἕως τέλους, like εἰς τέλος in John xiii. 1), even as you did acknowledge us to some extent, that we are subjects for your glorying, i.e., in whom you can glory (as your apostles) even as you are subjects (as our children) for our glorying, on the day of judgment.

15-16. He now passes on to deal with one of the charges made against him, namely, that he had changed his mind in reference to a projected visit to Corinth, and that this was but an instance of his general fickleness and unreliableness. He tells them here that in the confidence he had in their good opinion of him and in their title to his good opinion of them, he had intended to come first to them (crossing by sea from Ephesus to Corinth), then to pass north to Macedonia, and again to return to Corinth, so that during his journey they should *twice* have an opportunity of enjoying the spiritual favours which would accompany his visit (Cf. Rom. xv. 29; i. 11).—The first καὶ in verse 16 is epexegetic, or explanatory = "that is to say," and the verse explains verse 15. Apparently they had learned through a letter now lost or from some messenger, of this intention of his to come to them direct from Ephesus, and so when he announced to them in 1 Cor. xvi. 5 that he would come not direct but through Macedonia, his enemies at Corinth took advantage of the change of programme to attack him.

17. Whereas, then, I was thus minded (read βουλόμηνος), yet afterwards changed my mind, did I show fickleness (in *that instance*)? Or the things that I purpose (*generally*—note the change from the aorist to the present), do I purpose according

Aut quae cogito, secundum carnem cogito, ut sit apud me EST et NON ? ¹⁸ Fidelis autem Deus, quia sermo noster qui fuit apud vos, non est in illo

purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that there should be with me, *It is*, and *It is not*. ¹⁸ But God is faithful, for our preaching which was to you,

to the flesh, i.e., having regard to the desires of the carnal man, taking account of my own convenience, and not being guided by the Spirit ; so that there should be with me *Yes* and *No* ? Practically all the Greek authorities have the particles of affirmation and negation repeated here : " that there should be with me : *Yes, Yes*, and *No, No*." Grammatically the Greek might mean : " that my *Yes* should be a *Yes*, and my *No* a *No* " ; the Greek Fathers understood it so, and held that the Apostle, having repelled the charge of levity by the preceding question, now repels that of obstinacy, the present question implying that his *Yes* was not a stubborn affirmation nor his *No* a stubborn negation. But in the whole context here, and throughout the entire epistle there is no trace of a charge of obstinacy against him ; hence it is more probable that he is repelling the general charge of fickleness, his question implying that there was not with him at the same time the firm promise to do a thing and the intention not to do it. *Yes* and *No*, if twice repeated, are repeated merely for emphasis (cf. Matt. v. 37).

18. Passing for the moment over the particular charge of levity and fickleness, to which he will return in verse 23, he now meets the general accusation that was founded upon it, and he meets it in reference not only to himself but also to his fellow-preachers at Corinth (cf. Acts xviii. 5).

The best Greek reading may be rendered : But God is faithful that our word to you *is not* (οὐκ ἔστιν read by B K A C D F G P, It., Vulg. Copt.) *Yes* and *No*. " In illo " of the Vulgate is to be omitted. Instead of " *is not* " some authorities read " *was not*," and the reference then would naturally be to the preaching of the Apostle and his companions when they founded the church of Corinth some years before ; and so Estius, reading " *was not*," understood the passage. But reading " *is not*," as we must, we more naturally take the statement to mean that their words generally, and in the present context their promises especially, are not fickle and unreliable.

Some think that in the words : " But God is faithful that, etc.," the Apostle swears by God's fidelity, and render with the

EST et NON. ¹⁸ Dei enim Filius was not, *It is*, and *It is not*.
 IESUS CHRISTUS, qui in vobis ¹⁹ For the Son of God JESUS
 per nos prædicatus est, per CHRIST, who was preached
 me, et Silvanum, et Timo- among you by us, by me, and
 theum, non fuit EST et NON, sed Sylvanus, and Timothy, was
 not, *It is*, and *It is not*, but

R.V. : " But as God is faithful " (cf. xi. 10 ; Rom. xiv. 11). However the Apostle nowhere else uses this formula in swearing, though he employs it several times (1 Cor. i. 9 ; x. 13 ; cf. 1 Thess. v. 24 ; 2 Thess. iii. 3). Hence others prefer to hold that he merely mentions God's fidelity to His promises as an argument in favour of the fidelity of himself and his fellow-workers to theirs. God had sent them as His apostles (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 1, 2, 16), and His fidelity was evidence against their fickleness or mutability : " but God is faithful *unto this*, that, etc."

19. Very many, with St. Chrysostom and the Greeks generally, hold that the Apostle is speaking in this and the three following verses with special reference to his former preaching at Corinth, and defending it against a charge of being changeable and self-contradictory, urging that, whatever might be said of his conduct, his preaching at any rate was not open to the charge of variability and inconstancy. Notwithstanding the great authorities that support this view, we believe it to be mistaken, and due chiefly to the erroneous reading, "*was not*," referred to in the preceding verse. The argument of the Apostle is clear and consistent if we take him to be defending his word generally, and especially his promises, from the charge of fickleness and unreliableness : (17) Did I on this occasion show fickleness, or do I generally ? (18) God is faithful, to secure that it is not so with me or my companions. (19) For the Son of God whom we preached to you was not unfaithful to God's promises ; (20) for all the promises of God were fulfilled through Him. (21) But God has confirmed and anointed us, (22) and sealed us with the earnest of the Holy Spirit, as ministers of that faithful Christ (and hence we too are faithful to our promises). (23) But I call God to witness that in the particular instance of my not coming to Corinth (as I at first intended) I had good reason for changing my mind and not keeping my promise.

Thus the connection throughout the passage is clear and consistent, and, as we shall see, verse 19, and still more verse 20, receive a ready and natural explanation.

EST in illo fuit. ²⁰ Quotquot *It is, was in him.* ²⁰ For all
 enim promissiones Dei sunt, the promises of God are in him,
 in illo EST : ideo et per ipsum *It is : therefore also by him,*
 Amen Deo ad gloriam nostram. amen to God, unto our glory.
²¹ Qui autem confirmat nos ²¹ Now he that confirmeth us

In the present verse the Apostle reminds the Corinthians that the subject of the preaching of himself and his companions at Corinth, namely, the Son of God, Jesus Christ, was not fickle and unfaithful, "but *Yes* is come to pass (γέγονεν) through Him," in other words through Him is come to pass fulfilment and accomplishment.

The mention of Christ's Divinity at the very beginning of the verse (read ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ γὰρ υἱός) throws it into prominence and emphasises it as the foundation of Christ's fidelity.—On "Silvanus," otherwise Silas, the identity of the two being now generally admitted, see Acts xv.-xviii. 5 ; 1 Thess. i. 1 ; 2 Thess. i. 1 ; 1 Pet. v. 12.

20. Here the Apostle proves what he has just said, namely, that fulfilment has come to pass through Christ. "For howsoever many are the promises of God, through Him is their fulfilment" (ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ νοῖ), i.e., through Christ they were verified, through Him realised. The promises, as usually in St. Paul (cf. vii. 1 ; Rom. ix. 4 ; Gal. iii. 16, etc.), are those relating to the Messiah and the Messianic Kingdom.

Wherefore also through Him (the true reading is διὸ καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ, B K A C F G P, It., Vulg., Copt. and some Syr., not καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ) the Amen unto the glory of God (literally, "unto God for glory") through us (read "per nos" instead of "nostram" in Vulg.). The sense of the verse is, that since all the Messianic promises are fulfilled in Christ, wherefore also through Him, owing to Him, is made possible the Amen, which acknowledges their fulfilment (see above on 1 Cor. xiv. 16), an acknowledgment which redounds to the glory of God, and results from the labours of us who founded your church. "Us" does not refer to all the faithful nor to the Corinthians with St. Paul, but either to all the ministers of the Gospel or to St. Paul, Silvanus and Timothy ; this is made evident by the contrast between "us" and "you" in the next verse.

21. Christ, then, was not unreliable and unfaithful to promises ; but Paul and his companions are confirmed by God so as to be united to Christ (ἐς Χριστόν), and hence like unto Him even in

vobiscum in Christo, et qui with you in Christ, and that
 unxit nos Deus : ²² Qui et hath anointed us is God :
 signavit nos, et dedit pignus ²² Who also hath sealed us, and
 Spiritus in cordibus nostris. given the pledge of the Spirit

this respect of fidelity to their promises. This is further enforced by the fact that God anointed ($\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$, in evident allusion to $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\acute{o}\varsigma$) them, made them, as it were, other Christs to carry on His work.

The anointing in question was not a material one, since God is the anointer, but spiritual, consisting probably in the call to preach the Gospel and in the bestowal of the grace necessary to a fruitful discharge of the duties of their office. In the Old Law kings, priests and prophets were inaugurated by being anointed (cf. 1 Kings ix. 16 ; Exod. xl. 13, etc.), and so the word may be naturally taken here to signify the call to the Christian ministry. The verb $\chi\rho\iota\sigma\mu\acute{o}$ occurs only four times elsewhere in the New Testament (Luke iv. 18 ; Acts iv. 27 ; x. 38 ; Heb. i. 9), and in each instance it is Christ that is said to be anointed ; hence when Paul and his companions are here said to have been anointed, there can hardly be reference to any ordinary graces bestowed on them in common with the Corinthian faithful, but we are justified in understanding as above.

22. Like the anointing, the sealing too was done by God, and hence there is probably no reference to any of the three Sacraments that impress a *character* : Baptism, Confirmation, or even Orders. God had sealed St. Paul and his companions, stamped them as His accredited ministers by the charisms He had bestowed upon them, charisms which, like that of healing the sick or speaking in tongues, both supplemented the internal unctions they had received and proved to the world, as a spiritual and internal thing like a *character* could not do, that God had set His seal upon them.

The remaining words of the verse may be more aptly rendered, "and gave the *earnest* of the Spirit in our hearts." Neither the Vulgate nor our English translation of $\tau\acute{o}\nu \acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ is correct. Both the Latin "pignus" and our "pledge" denote something that is taken back by the giver when the contract with which it is connected has been completed ; but $\acute{\alpha}\rho\chi\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ ("earnest") is a (small) sum paid in advance as the ratification of a bargain, and is in fact part-payment, and not taken back. Since, then, the Holy Ghost and His gifts are not given us to be taken away

²² Ego autem testem Deum invoco in animam meam, quod parcens vobis, non veni ultra Corinthum : non quia dominamur fidei vestrae, sed adiutores sumus gaudii vestri, nam fide statis.

in our hearts. ²³ But I call God to witness upon my soul, that to spare you, I came not any more to Corinth, not because we exercise dominion over your faith : but we are helpers of your joy : for in faith you stand.

again, but rather to be crowned with full payment in the life of glory to come, ἀρραβὼν ought to be rendered in Latin by "arrha," and in English by "earnest." "The earnest of the Spirit" means simply that the Spirit is the earnest, πνεύματος being the genitive of apposition ; thus the Apostle writes to the Ephesians : "You were signed with the Holy Spirit of promise, who is the earnest of our inheritance" (Eph. iv. 30). God, then, not only called St. Paul and his companions to the ministry, and endowed them with miraculous powers, but, as His greatest gift, He gave them the Holy Ghost (to dwell) in their hearts, as earnest of the full and glorious reward that awaited them in the life to come. From all which the Corinthians might understand how unlikely it was that they would prove fickle and unreliable.

This seems to us the most reasonable view of vv. 21, 22, but it must be admitted that it is extremely difficult to be certain as to what precisely is meant in each case by anointing, sealing, and giving the earnest of the Spirit.

23. Some would begin a new chapter with this verse, but we cannot agree, for the connection with the preceding is very close, the Apostle, after repelling the general charge of fickleness (17*b*), returning now to the particular incident that gave rise to it (17*a*). In our opinion, the chapter might more appropriately have ended with ii. 4.

"I" is emphatic. The Apostle in the last five verses has been defending his fellow-workers as well as himself from the charge of fickleness ; now he says : as for myself and my promised visit to Corinth, etc.

He does not swear *by* his soul, but he swears, or calls God as witness, against his soul, to punish him if he is not stating the truth, "*excusat se per juramentum duplex, unum attestationis, aliud execrationis*" (St. Thomas). What he swears is, that it was to spare them he had not yet come to Corinth, as he had formerly

intended. Of course he had already been in Corinth, and on two occasions, as we shall see, before this was written; but he is speaking now in reference to a third visit, which he had promised but had not paid, nay, had postponed till he should first visit Macedonia (1 Cor. xvi. 5). We take οὐκ ἐτι ἦλθον, with Grimm. (*Lex. sub. voce, οὐκ ἐτι*), as equal "*adhuc non veni.*" The resulting sense would be the same if we rendered: "I came no more to Corinth," or with the R.V.: "I forbore to come to Corinth." He postponed his visit in order to spare them, as the unsatisfactory state of their church would have compelled him, if present, to deal severely. Hence he remained away, and instead of coming to them himself, sent them the letter which is our *present* First Epistle to the Corinthians (ii. 3).

"Not because we exercise dominion over your faith"; rather: "not that we lord it over your faith." Many think this is added because he has spoken of *sparing*, since he who claims to spare implies that he could punish, and that there is matter for punishment. In this view the sense is: "in speaking of sparing you, I don't mean that I and my fellow-apostles have any lordship over your *faith*, so as to be able to alter it or punish you on account of it, for in faith you stand," *i.e.*, for your faith is sound, and in it we have nothing to blame. The reference would be to the faith of the Corinthian Church generally, notwithstanding particular exceptions (1 Cor. xv. 12). In this view the clause: "but we are helpers of your joy" would be thrown in parenthetically, and it would be implied that the fault lay in their morals. But it seems to us perhaps simpler and more satisfactory to take the present clause not as explaining the word "*spare*," but as developing the reason why he remained away from Corinth: "not because we teachers lord it over your faith (as our enemies there may assert), doing as we please and counting on your pardon, but because we are helpers (with yourselves or with God—συνεργοί) of your joy (and so chose what was best for you)—helpers of your joy, as we ought to be, seeing that (whatever your faults) you are sound in the faith. If this view be correct, it is only in the first three verses of the next chapter that the Apostle explains how he *spared* them, namely, by deciding not to come with sorrow and by writing to them instead.

CHAPTER II

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

He explains what he meant by saying (i. 23) that he had spared them ; he wished not to come again with sorrow, saddening those whom he would rather gladden (vv. 1-2), and hence he thought it better to write, in order that they might set things right before he came (3) ; and if his letter caused them sorrow, that was not its purpose (4). Passing on to the principal occasion of his own sorrow and theirs, the crime of the incestuous sinner, he orders and entreats them to show him charity, now that he is repentant, by admitting him again to their society (5-8) ; thus they will prove their obedience by forgiving now, even as they were formerly asked to prove it by punishing (7). To encourage them to forgive, the Apostle promises to ratify their decision, and refers to some lenient step already taken by himself in regard to the sinner for the purpose of foiling the designs of Satan (10-11). After the digression in 5-11, he takes up again the concluding thought of verse 4, his love for the Corinthians. Then, apparently at the thought of the good news brought by Titus, he thanks God for causing himself and his companions to triumph, and for diffusing through them everywhere the odour of the Gospel (14). For they are a sweet fragrance of Christ ; though the occasion of spiritual death to some, they bring spiritual life to others ; and of such a sublime ministry what mortal is worthy ? (15-16). Finally he strikes at the false teachers in Corinth (17).

¹ STATUI autem hoc ipsum ¹ BUT I determined this with
apud me, ne iterum in tristitia myself, not to come to you

As we pointed out in the previous verse, the connection with what precedes is very close ; the Apostle continues to explain why he remained away from Corinth.

1. " But I determined this with (rather ' for ') myself (as the course to be taken), not to come to you again in (or ' with ') sorrow." The obvious meaning of this implies that he had come to them with sorrow—causing sorrow to them and so to himself—on some previous occasion, and the true Greek reading : τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἔλθειν (not τὸ μὴ πάλιν ἔλθειν ἐν λύπῃ πρὸς

venirem ad vos. ² Si enim ego contristo vos : et quis est qui me laetificet, nisi qui contristatur ex me ? ³ Et hoc ipsum scripsi vobis, ut non cum venero, tristitiam super tristitiam habeam, de quibus oportuerat me gaudere : confidens in omni-

again in sorrow. ² For if I make you sorrowful ; who is he then that can make me glad, but the same who is made sorrowful by me ? ³ And I wrote this same to you ; that I may not, when I come, have sorrow upon sorrow, from them

ὀπῶς) confirms this view. What he determined was, that he would not pay them a second sorrowful visit, not that the second visit he would pay them should not be a sorrowful one. Hence although St. Luke in the Acts mentions only one visit of Paul to Corinth previous to this time (Acts xviii. 1, 11, 18), there must have been two, unless it be held that the first sorrowful coming was that referred to in Acts xviii. But this seems most unlikely, seeing that on the one hand Paul was then a stranger to the Corinthians, and on the other the context here seems to require that he refers to a coming made sorrowful by the conduct of the Corinthians. See above, *Introd.*, ii. 1 (a).

2. The meaning is : for if I come bringing sorrow to you, who then (καὶ τίς ; cf. Mark x. 26 ; Luke x. 29 ; xviii. 26 ; John ix. 36, etc.) will there be to gladden me in Corinth ? Plainly none but you, and you cannot, having been yourselves made sorrowful by me. The singular ὁ λυποῦμαι is thus taken in a collective sense (cf. James ii. 6 ; 1 Pet. iv. 18). Many of the older commentators, however, took a different view of this verse : who then can gladden me but he who is saddened by me (and thereby led to repentance) ?—as if the Apostle were referring to the joy he would experience at their sorrow unto repentance. But such a thought has no place in the present context ; it would be a reason for hastening to Corinth, not for delaying his visit.

3. It is disputed to what writing the Apostle here refers, to this epistle itself or to a lost one written *after* our present First Epistle to the Corinthians or to our present First Epistle to the Corinthians. The aorist ἔγραψα might refer either to this epistle (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 15 ; Gal. vi. 11, etc.) or to a previous one. But if we compare with the present passage vii. 8, where the reference undoubtedly is to a previous epistle (ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ), there can be no doubt that the reference is the same in the verse before us. Moreover the present epistle was not written in the affliction and anguish of heart referred to below in verse 4 (cf. vii. 7, 14, 16).

bus vobis, quia meum gaudium, omnium vestrum est. * Nam ex multa tribulatione et angustia cordis scripsi vobis per multas lacrymas: non ut contristemini, sed ut sciatis quam charitatem habeam abundantius in vobis.

of whom I ought to rejoice; having confidence in you all that my joy is the joy of you all. * For out of much affliction, and anguish of heart I wrote to you with many tears; not that you should be made sorrowful; but that you might know the charity I have more abundantly towards you.

Hence a previous epistle is referred to. Nor is there any solid reason for denying that it is our present First Epistle to the Corinthians, which may well have been written in anguish of heart and tears (v. 4), if we bear in mind, on the one hand, the zeal and charity of the Apostle, and on the other, the factions (1 Cor. i. 12), the tolerated incest, the litigation among Christians, the fornication (1 Cor. v.-vi.), the abuses in connection with the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist (1 Cor. xi. 20), (1 Cor. xv. 12), which it shows to have existed at Corinth. We regard as quite improbable, therefore, the view of some modern Protestant commentators, who, in order to explain the present passage, have invented a lost epistle to the Corinthians, written between our present First and Second Epistles.*

What the Apostle says here, therefore, is, that he wrote our First Epistle to the Corinthians having this object in view, namely, that they should amend before he came (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 21), and so allow his coming to be joyful; and he wrote it trusting in them, that by reason of their sympathy with him they rejoiced when he rejoiced, and so would be glad to spare him sorrow. Some think that the reference in τοῦτο αὐτό is to the painful passage in 1 Cor. iv. 8-vi. 20, which, as vividly present to the mind of the Apostle and his readers, might be referred to thus abruptly; others take the phrase adverbially: "unto this end," cf. v. 5; Rom. ix. 17, etc.—Instead of "sorrow upon sorrow" (cf. Phil. ii. 27) most authorities have only "sorrow."

4. It might naturally be objected to what he has said about his anxiety to spare them sorrow: Why, then, did you write a

* Still more improbable is the view that portion of the said lost epistle stands in 2 Cor. x-xiii. This view, which was first put forward in Germany by Hausrath in 1870, has since been widely adopted by Protestant scholars in England; but German scholars have now rightly abandoned it, and we have no doubt that it will soon be abandoned in England. Cf. Menzies, "The Second Epistle of the Apostle Paul to the Corinthians," *Introd.*, p. xix. See above, *Introd.* i. 2.

⁴ Si quis autem contristavit, ⁵ And if any one have caused
non me contristavit; sed ex grief, he hath not grieved me;
parte, ut non onerem omnes but in part, that I may not

letter or a passage that gave us so much pain? Here he replies that it was with reluctance and tears he wrote it, his object being to show his special love for them. He had another object indeed—to secure their repentance and amendment, but he prefers to dwell now on the evidence of his love for them which the letter afforded, for there is no stronger evidence of true charity than when a superior rebukes the sins of those whom he loves, though knowing that the rebuke will cause pain.—“Not that you should be made sorrowful.” It was not their sorrow he intended, though no doubt he foresaw it, but their amendment, and the manifestation of his love towards them. “More abundantly.” Estius and others hold that the comparative here has only the force of a positive, and indeed it is not easy to see why the Apostle’s charity should be greater towards the Corinthian Church than towards any other he had founded. For “in vobis” of Vulg. read “in vos” (ἐς ὑμᾶς).

5. The reference in the two preceding verses to his letter, naturally led the Apostle on to think of the sinner whose flagrant sin had been the occasion of the severest and most painful portion of it (cf. 1 Cor. v. 1, 2, 6), and so he now takes occasion to refer at some length to the sinner’s case. All the Fathers and early writers who touched the question, except Tertullian, understood the reference in vv. 5–10 here of the incestuous sinner referred to in 1 Cor. v. 1–5. See the references in Cornely on this verse. It is clear that the man had repented in the meantime, and the Apostle’s former severity now gives place to overflowing charity. It was evidently Titus who, on his return from Corinth, brought the news of the sinner’s conversion and repentance (cf. vii. 6–13).

“But if anyone has caused grief, etc.” The conditional form of expression is used, not that there is any doubt in the Apostle’s mind about the fact, but as being less direct and less severe upon the now repentant sinner.

“He hath not grieved me; but in part, that I may not burden you all.” This rendering, as it stands, can hardly be made to bear any intelligible sense, and there is no doubt that it is wrong. Rather: “he hath not grieved me, but in part (that I may not bear too hard—or, with R.V., ‘press too heavily’) you all.” The sense most probably is: he has not so much grieved me as (or,

vos. * Sufficit illi qui eiusmodi est, obiurgatio hæc quæ fit a pluribus: 7 Ita ut e contrario magis donetis, et consolemini, ne forte abundantiori tristitia

burden you all. * To him that is such a one this rebuke is sufficient, that is given by many: 7 So that contrariwise you should rather pardon and comfort him, lest perhaps such a one be swallowed up with

"not me *alone*, but") he has to some extent grieved you all—I say to some extent, that I may not bear too hard on him by charging him with having grieved all of you deeply. The restrictive clause, "to some extent" is probably meant not merely to spare the sinner's feelings, but also to hint that not all the Corinthian Christians had grieved *as they ought* over his scandalous conduct.

Some, retaining the punctuation of the Vulgate, have understood: he has not grieved me excessively, but only partially—I say partially, that I may not burden you all with sorrow on account of excessive grief of mine. Or, understanding you in the first member, "he has grieved not me only, but *some* of you (you in part—cf. Rom. xi. 25), that I may not charge you all with want of sorrow at his conduct."

6. Having referred to the sinner, the Apostle proceeds to indicate how the Corinthian Christians are to treat him, now that he is repentant. They had been ordered to excommunicate him (1 Cor. v. 1, 13), and St. Paul had evidently learned from Titus that they had done so with good results (vii. 7-12); and now he says that this *punishment* (ἐπιτίμω) is not adequately rendered by the Vulgate "objurgatio" or our "rebuke"; cf. Wisdom iii. 10) which had been inflicted by the Corinthian superiors, and enforced by the general body of the Corinthian Christians refusing to hold any intercourse with the sinner, is or may be regarded as (ἰκανὸν ἔστι or ἔστω) sufficient punishment for him, now that he is repentant. Τῷ τοιοῦτῳ is not any person who is such, but *this* person, such as he is, that is, repentant (cf. 1 Cor. v. 5; Acts xxii. 22). ἰκανὸν is used substantively. Ἀὐτῇ may mean "of itself," without any further punishment.

7. The end of the punishment having been attained in the sinner's conversion, the Apostle says that instead of persisting in inflicting it, they should on the contrary now rather pardon and comfort him, lest perchance *he in the circumstances* (ὁ τοιοῦτος) be swallowed up with excessive sorrow. The "pardon" implies

absorbeatur qui eiusmodi est. overmuch sorrow. * For which
 * Propter quod obsecro vos, ut cause I beseech you, that you
 confirmetis in illum charitatem. would confirm your charity

that strictly speaking the debt of punishment had not yet been fully paid, and that the Corinthian Church was competent to remit it. The superiors could remove the excommunication, and the Corinthian faithful could co-operate by receiving the sinner back to their society and friendship. But if something still remained to be atoned for, and if St. Paul tells the Corinthian Church to pardon it, surely this implies, in case a debt of punishment still remained due to God, that the pardon availed before God, and not merely in the eyes of the Church; otherwise, as St. Thomas argues (*Summa*, Quaest. 25, Art. 1), the sinner would be injured rather than benefited, since he would be relieved of earthly punishment only to be reserved for punishment afterwards in Purgatory. Hence, although there is question here *directly* only of removing an ecclesiastical punishment—what we now call excommunication—yet many theologians agree with St. Thomas in finding here and in verse 10 an argument for the Church's power of granting indulgences that avail before God. The Council of Trent (Sess. 25, *Decret. de Indulg.*) anathematises those "who either assert that indulgences are useless or deny that the Church has the power of granting them."—"Swallowed up" alludes most probably to death by drowning; see Psalm cxxiii. 2, 3.

8. Παρακαλῶ must have here the sense of "I beseech" or "I exhort," * though in the preceding verse it is evidently used in the sense of comforting (see above on i. 4). The Apostle beseeches or exhorts when, as St. Chrysostom says, he might command. What he exhorts them to do is, publicly to manifest and ratify charity towards the sinner. Κυβῶσαι (κύβος, strength, authority) means to sanction or confirm a thing publicly, and hence the Apostle exhorts them to manifest publicly charity towards the sinner by receiving him again into the bosom of the Church, the superiors formally removing the excommunication, and the

* Cornely takes παρακαλῶ here in the sense of *commanding*, but the word nowhere else has this meaning, for the two texts to which he appeals (1 Tim. vi. 2; Tit. ii. 13) do not require it. He is right indeed in holding that the Apostle commands receiving back the sinner, but this command is not conveyed by παρακαλῶ, but by the intimation (v. 6) that the sinner was already sufficiently punished in the circumstances, and by the positive direction to receive him back (v. 7). Hence the Apostle first commands that he be received back, then exhorts or entreats that it be done publicly and gracefully.

* Ideo enim et scripsi, ut cognoscam experimentum vestrum, an in omnibus obedientes sitis.

¹⁰ Cui autem aliquid donastis,

towards him. * For to this end also did I write, that I may know the experiment of you, whether you be obedient in all things. ¹⁰ And to whom you

faithful acting towards the sinner accordingly. "Unite the member to the body, add the sheep to the fold, show him warm affection" (Theod.).

9. The aorist ἔγραψα might refer, as an epistolary aorist, to what he has just written here about receiving back the sinner. The sense would then be : for to this end do I bid you to receive him back, that I may know the proof of you, whether you are obedient in all things—in publicly restoring him to the fold as well as in publicly expelling him. But as the same word ἔγραψα in verse 3 refers back to his former letter, a reference to that former letter, our present First Epistle to the Corinthians, is more probable here also.

The sense, then, seems to be : receive him back, and be obedient, for to this end did I *also write* my former letter (note, εἰς τοῦτο γὰρ καὶ ἔγραψα, not ἔγραψα γὰρ καὶ εἰς τοῦτο) that "I might know" ("cognoscerem" instead of Vulg. "cognoscam") the proof of you (i.e., put you to the test) whether you are obedient in all things, in things unpleasant and difficult (like the punishment of the sinner), as well as in things pleasant and easy. It is as if he said : in this present letter I ask for your obedience, for I also wrote my former letter to test it.

Of course the sinner's conversion was the final and principal object St. Paul had in view when writing 1 Cor. v. 1-7 ; but this would easily be understood, and he prefers to dwell upon the other object, the testing the obedience of the Corinthians, in order that he may the more stimulate them to obedience now in receiving back the sinner.

10. Lest they should still hesitate about showing mercy to the sinner, he tells them that he is ready to ratify whatever forgiveness they extend : "But to whom you pardon anything, I also." "Donastis" in Vulg. ought to be "donatis" ; the evidence for the latter is absolutely decisive. Though the statement is general, the context justifies us in restricting it to the case of the sinner, who is thus again vaguely referred to.

"For what I also have pardoned, if I have pardoned anything, etc.," reading : ὃ κεχώρισται εἰ τι κεχώρισται with B & A

et ego : nam et ego quod do- have pardoned anything, I also.
navi, si quid donavi, propter For, what I have pardoned, if

C E F G O P, It., Vulg., Syr., Copt. There seems to be reference to something different from the ratification of the pardon to be granted by the Corinthians, which has been referred to in the first clause of the verse. The Apostle seems to say : I shall ratify what you do, for I myself have done so and so for your sakes ; the use of γάρ, the emphatic repetition of ἐγώ, and the change to the perfect tense (κεχώρισται) all go to prove this. But what he refers to, is not clear. It is not likely that he alludes to previous pardons extended to other sinners in Corinth. Probably he is still speaking with reference to the incestuous sinner, and alluding to the remission of the dire punishment, which he had previously declared his intention to inflict (see above on 1 Cor. v. 3-5, p. 64). He had decided to give Satan power over the sinner's body to afflict it, but perhaps he relented and did not do so,* and this non-infliction of that terrible punishment may be the " pardon " here alluded to. Or if he did inflict it, he may already have withdrawn it, and this withdrawal would be the " pardon " in question. In either case, the clause, " if I have pardoned anything," does not express doubt, any more than the conditional clause in verse 5, for we can hardly suppose the Apostle to doubt about the practical effect of the pardon he had granted.

He adds that it was on account of the Corinthian Christians he had granted the pardon. Some say he means on account of a request of theirs ; others, that he did not wish to put them to shame by inflicting or continuing the heavier punishment, when they had shown themselves so remiss (1 Cor. v. 2) in regard to the lighter. The next verse seems to show that he means that his lenient measures were intended for the benefit of the Corinthian Church, as extreme severity might lead to despair in the incestuous man and others.

" In the person of Christ " is to be connected with " I have pardoned," which is understood. It is uncertain whether the phrase means in the person and with the authority of Christ, as

* Even the Apostles did not always carry out their intentions or realise their anticipations. St. Paul himself told the Ephesians (Acts xx. 25) that he knew they should see his face no more, yet it is practically certain from the Pastoral Epistles that he visited Asia Minor, and probably Ephesus, again (Cf. 1 Tim. i. 3 ; iv. 13, etc.).

vos in persona Christi, ¹¹ Ut non circumveniamur a Satana ; non enim ignoramus cogitationes eius.

¹² Cum venissem autem Troadem propter evangelium Christi, et ostium mihi apertum esset in Domino, ¹³ Non habui requiem spiritui meo, eo quod

I have pardoned anything, for your sakes have I done it in the person of Christ, ¹¹ That we be not over-reached by Satan. For we are not ignorant of his devices.

¹² And when I was come to Troas for the gospel of Christ, and a door was opened unto me in the Lord, ¹³ I had no

Estius and many others hold, or before the face of Christ (cf. Prov. viii. 30), in His presence, i.e., Christ looking on and approving, as is maintained by Cornely and many others.

11. Here we have the object he had in view in his lenient treatment of the sinner ; he meant that no extreme severity on his part should give Satan an opportunity of leading men to despair. The verb *παρασχεῖν* ("to overreach") means to take more than one's share, to gain an advantage. St. Chrysostom remarks upon the present verse, that in ordinary temptations Satan uses his own weapons, but when under the guise of excessive repentance or through the excessive severity of superiors he leads people to despair, then indeed he turns our own weapons against us, overreaches us, and takes more than his share.

"For we are not ignorant of his devices." The devices referred to are Satan's schemes of compassing evil through what seems to be good. Such devices in a general way were not unknown to St. Paul or his readers, for the Scripture made them evident, e.g., Gen. iii. 4-5, where Eve under the guise of good was tempted to evil ; but of course only God knows all the devil's devices. The Greek word rendered "devices" here, is rendered by "senses" in iii. 14, by "minds" in iv. 4 ; xi. 3, and by "understanding" in x. 5 ; Phil. iv. 7. Properly it designates the act of the mind in thinking or designing, and then the mind itself.

12-13. After the digression in vv. 5-11, he resumes with the concluding thought of verse 4, his love for the Corinthians ; and he now advances striking evidence for it from the fact that even in circumstances favourable to the preaching of the Gospel his soul could not find rest till he met his ambassador to Corinth, and learned from him the condition of its church. Troas was the name of a district and of a town on the North-west coast of Asia Minor ; the town is probably meant here. This coming of the Apostle to Troas is passed over in silence by St. Luke in

non invenerim Titum fratrem meum : sed valefaciens eis, profectus sum in Macedoniam.

¹⁴ Deo autem gratias, qui semper triumphat nos in CHRISTO IESU, et odorem notitiæ suæ manifestat per

rest in my spirit, because I found not Titus my brother, but bidding them farewell, I went into Macedonia.

¹⁴ Now thanks be to God, who always maketh us to triumph in CHRIST JESUS, and manifesteth the odour of His

Acts xx. 1, but St. Luke records a previous (Acts xvi. 8) and a subsequent (Acts xx. 6) visit of the Apostle to the place. It is clear from the present verse that St. Paul intended to preach there on this occasion, and that the prospect was promising "in the Lord," *i.e.*, in the work of the Lord, or rather, through the grace of Christ, which had prepared many of the people of Troas to hearken to the Gospel. Yet such was his anxiety to meet Titus, who had evidently been told to meet him at Troas, and to learn the condition of the Corinthian Church and the effect of his former letter, that he could find no rest for (or in) his spirit, but crossed the Ægean sea to Macedonia, hoping there to meet with Titus on his way back from Corinth, or at all events thus to make another stage on the journey which, guided by the Holy Spirit, he had mapped out for himself through Macedonia to Achaia and Jerusalem (Acts xix. 21).

Titus, who is here called "brother," *i.e.*, companion in preaching the Gospel, was afterwards left in supreme charge of the church of Crete (Tit. i. 5), where he lived to extreme old age, and St. Paul towards the end of his life wrote to him the Epistle which we still have.

14. The triumphant strain into which the Apostle now breaks forth can hardly be fully accounted for by any success he had in Macedonia, for see below vii. 5 ; but rather by the good news, which Titus brought from Corinth (vii. 6-7), and which reminded him of God's goodness to him always and everywhere. The verb ἐπικυβερῶν, in classical writers and in the only other place where it occurs in St. Paul, Col. ii. 15, means "to lead captive in triumph," but in the present verse it most probably means "to cause to triumph," * and God caused Paul and his companions

* " Verba quæ apud antiquiores Græcos neutra sunt, a junioribus et maxime ab Alexandrinis velut transitiva ad modum Hebraici Hiphil hæc raro usurpantur : μαθητεύειν *discere*, sed μαθητεύειν τινά *efficere ut aliquis discat, i.e., docere* (Matt. xxviii. 19) ; βασιλεύειν *regnare* et βασιλεύειν τινά *regem facere aliquem* (1 Reg. viii. 22) ; ἀνατρέπειν *ariri* sed ὁ θεὸς ἀνατρέπει τὸν ἥλιον *ariri facit solem* (Matt. v. 45), etc." (Cornely).

nos in omni loco: ¹⁵ Quia Christi bonus odor sumus Deo, in iis qui salvi fiunt, et in iis qui pereunt: ¹⁶ Aliis quidem odor mortis in mortem: aliis autem odor vitae in vitam. Et ad haec quis tam idoneus?

knowledge by us in every place. ¹⁵ For we are the good odour of Christ unto God, in them that are saved, and in them that perish. ¹⁶ To the one indeed the odour of death unto death; but to the others the odour of life unto life. And for these things who is so

or perhaps all the Apostles (ἡμεῖς) to triumph in Christ (omit "Jesus"), i.e., *through* Christ and His grace.

"The odour of His knowledge" means the odour *which* is the knowledge of Him (God), τῆς γνώσεως being a genitive of apposition. The thought of a triumphal procession with its incense, etc., probably suggested the metaphor of the odour. The metaphor forcibly sets forth the penetrating and diffusive power of the Gospel.

15. Some think that the Apostle now speaks of himself and other ministers of the Gospel as the *fragrant thing* (εὐωδία) from which the odour (ὀσμή) spreads, and there is no doubt that the word εὐωδία could bear this sense (cf. Grimm). But since in the next verse (16) the same people are spoken of as an odour (ὀσμή), it is better to take εὐωδία of a *sweet fragrance*, and hold that while in v. 15 he speaks of the knowledge of Christ as the odour, in the present verse he refers to himself and his companions as the sweet fragrance. The sense is: for we are Christ's sweet fragrance (Christ being the source of their influence) unto God (to please Him and glorify Him) in the case of those who are being saved, and of those who are perishing.

16. The Gospel and its preachers retain their salutary power, but the effects are very different in those differently disposed. To those who are perishing, i.e., who refuse to believe or to put their faith into practice, the *preachers* (the subject remains the same as in v. 15) are an occasion of spiritual ruin like Christ Himself (Luke ii. 34: "Behold this (child) is set up for the fall, and for the resurrection of many in Israel"); but to those who believe and act accordingly, they are an occasion of spiritual life. Such is clearly the sense.

If we follow the reading represented by the Vulgate, the "odour of death unto death" probably means a deadly odour leading to spiritual death, the other, a life-giving odour leading to spiritual life; but the best Greek MSS., supported by the

17 Non enim sumus sicut sufficient? 17 For we are not plurimi, adulterantes verbum as many adulterating the word Dei, sed ex sinceritate, sed of God, but with sincerity, but sicut ex Deo, coram Deo, in as from God before God in Christo loquimur. Christ we speak.

Coptic version and a number of the earlier Fathers, read "an odour *from* death (ἐκ θανάτου) unto death," and "an odour *from* life unto life," which probably means an odour as from a dead and putrid body leading to death ("odor qualis spargitur a morte, i.e., re mortifera, pestifera, cadavere, et ipse mortifer," Grimm), and an odour as from a living and life-giving body leading to spiritual life. "For the two different effects of the Word of God, cf. Luke ii. 34; John xii. 48; Matt. xi. 21. Nothing is more clearly contained in Holy Writ than this, that the teaching of Christ and of the envoys of Christ to men is not a teaching which it is open to mankind to reject with impunity. The message is not: 'there is a way, one of many good ways, if you like to take it': but, as St. Peter put it on the day of Pentecost: *Save yourselves from this perverse generation* (Acts ii. 40). Therefore a Church whose chief mark is 'comprehensiveness' cannot be the Church of Christ" (Rickaby).

"And for these things who is so sufficient?" "So" (Vulg. "tam" must be omitted; probably "quis tam" (Vulg.) is a copyist's error for "quisnam." The implied reply to the question is that nobody is sufficient of his own strength and without the help of God, from whom he needs a call to such an exalted ministry (iii. 5-6).

17. This verse is most naturally connected with v. 15 and the first part of v. 16: we are Christ's "sweet fragrance," "for we are not as the many adulterating, etc.," and the question, "and for these things who is sufficient?" is thrown in parenthetically. Καπηλεύοντες may contain both the idea of adulterating, and that of making profit by, the word of God; the Apostle is hitting at certain teachers in Corinth, who mixed false doctrine (cf. iv. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 12) or human conceits with the Gospel, and also made money by it (cf. xi. 20). Unlike such, Paul and his companions speak "as of sincerity," i.e., as teachers really sincere, speaking the truth at all costs; as "from God," who sent and inspired them; "in the presence of God," who sees their thoughts; "in Christ," i.e., united to Christ and supported by His grace (cf. i. 12).

CHAPTER III

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

St. Paul and his fellow-workers had no need to extol themselves ; the Church of Corinth was their commendatory letter (vv. 1-3). Their confidence was not due to any feeling of self-sufficiency or arrogant presumption, but was based upon Christ ; of themselves, without God's grace, they were incapable of even one salutary thought, and it was He who made them ministers of the New Testament, the Testament of the Spirit (4-6). Next he takes occasion to point out the superior glory of this New Testament (7-11) ; the Law led to spiritual death, and was only letters graven on stones, the New Testament is the giving of life and of the Spirit (7-8) ; the Law was unto condemnation, the New Testament is unto justice ; and in comparison with the glory attaching to the preaching of the Gospel, to the Christian ministry, and the New Dispensation, the glory that attached to the giving of the Law, to the Mosaic ministry, and the Old Dispensation, was really nothing (9-10) ; finally the Law and all that it stood for was transitory, the New Testament and all that it stands for is eternal (11). As ministers, then, of this glorious New Testament, Paul and his companions are outspoken, having nothing to hide ; but the minds of the Jews, dulled of old, are dulled and incredulous still, and the veil of unbelief remains unlifted from their hearts, for only through Christ can it be lifted (12-15). But whensoever their hearts shall really turn to God, the veil shall disappear (16) ; the God, however, to whom they must turn is the Holy Spirit of life and liberty in the New Covenant (17). Finally, the Apostle says that all Christians, reflecting as mirrors the glory of God, are transformed into His likeness by a transformation worthy of a Divine Spirit as its source (18).

¹ INCIPIMUS iterum nos-
metipsos commendare ? aut
numquid egemus (sicut qui-
dam) commendatitiis epistolis

¹ Do we begin again to com-
mend ourselves ? Or do we
need (as some do) epistles of
commendation to you, or from

1. Apparently the Apostle had been charged by his adversaries in Corinth with puffing himself and his fellow-ministers of the Gospel, and he had probably learned of this charge through Titus.

ad vos, aut ex vobis ? ² Epistola nostra vos estis, scripta in cordibus nostris, quae scitur et legitur ab omnibus hominibus : ³ Manifestati quod epistola estis Christi, ministrata a nobis, et scripta non atramento, sed

you ? ² You are our epistle, written in our hearts, which is known and read by all men : ³ Being manifested, that you are the epistle of Christ, ministered by us, and written not with ink, but with the Spirit of

His adversaries may have pointed to such passages as 1 Cor. iv. 9-16 ; ix. 1-2, 15-22, etc. He now takes up this charge.

" Or do we need, etc. ? " Read ἢ μή (" or do we ? "), not εἰ μή (" unless "). In the latter reading the sense would be that he was not beginning to commend himself, *unless* indeed he needed (and this would be ironical) like certain other teachers, commendatory letters. But the reading " or do we ? " is better supported, and is in every way more probable.

2. We need no letters of commendation—I and Timothy, founders of your church—you, our converts, are our letter, near and dear to our hearts, and known and read by all men. Such is the Apostle's reply to his own question. We think that this is the simplest and most natural view of " written in our hearts." The Corinthian Christians were dear to the hearts of their teachers, and as they have just been metaphorically referred to as a letter, the fact that they were dear, would be naturally expressed by saying that the letter was written in the teachers' hearts. " Which is known, etc." The prominence of Corinth as capital of Achaia made the condition of its church, and the connection of St. Paul and his companions with it, widely known.

3. This is to be connected closely with the preceding : Ye are our letter of commendation, inasmuch as ye are manifestly seen to be a letter of Christ, etc. If we strip the statement of its metaphorical dress, the sense is that the Corinthian Church was established by Christ through the ministry of Paul and his companions and chiefly through the grace of the Holy Ghost. As such, it was, as it were, a Divine letter of commendation for St. Paul and his companions. " Not with ink " alludes to the ordinary manner of writing letters at that time, with ink on papyrus. " The Spirit of the living God " is the Holy Ghost, and God is said to be " living " to imply His power to regenerate the Corinthians and quicken them to a new life. " Not in tables of stone." Letters of commendation were not written on tables of stone, but the mention of the Spirit of God seems to have

spiritu Dei vivi : non in tabulis lapideis, sed in tabulis cordis carnalibus.

‘Fiduciam autem talem habemus per Christum ad Deum : ‘Non quod sufficientes

the living God : not in tables of stone, but in the fleshy tables of the heart.

‘And such confidence we have, through Christ towards God. ‘Not that we are

suggested to the Apostle the thought of the “finger of God” (Exod. xxxi. 18), which wrote the ten commandments on two tables of stone in the wilderness, and this still further suggested the thought of the contrast, which he will develop in a moment (vv. 6-7), between the Old and the New Dispensation, the Old with its tables of stone symbolical of the stony hearts of the Jews, and the New with the Divine laws written by the Holy Ghost on the impressionable hearts of men (cf. Ezech. xxxvi. 26 ; Heb. viii. 10). “But in the fleshy tables of the heart.” This supposes καρδίας (gen. sing.) to be the correct reading, but there is at least as much authority for καρδίας (dat. plural), “in tables (that are) hearts of flesh.” However the question of reading here is unimportant, as the resulting sense is the same in both.

4. Lest such (τοιούτην) confidence as he has just shown in reference to himself and his companions in ii. 15-17 and in the claim which he has just made that the Corinthian Church was a sort of commendatory letter from Christ, should seem to savour of presumption or false pride, he now says that they have this confidence, not in dependence on themselves, but through Christ, by whose grace alone they are what they are (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 10). “Towards God.” Many take the sense to be : we have this confidence through Christ, in God as *its source*, but we doubt if πρὸς τὸν θεόν admits such a sense ; it seems more natural to take the words as in Rom. iv. 2, “before God,” as if the Apostle said : we have this confidence not only before men, but also before God, who knows our thoughts and shall be our Judge.

5. Whatever be the true position of ἀφ’ ἑαυτῶν, the opposition between the two clauses of the verse shows that the Apostle means that it was not of (ἀφ’) themselves, as from (ἐξ, denoting the primary cause) themselves that they were sufficient to think anything, but their sufficiency was from God ; that is to say, the words “of ourselves, as from ourselves” are not to be connected with “to think” but with “not that we are sufficient” : “Not that of ourselves, as from ourselves, we are sufficient to think anything, but our sufficiency is from God.” The words

simus cogitare aliquid a nobis, sufficient to think anything
 quasi ex nobis : sed sufficientia of ourselves, as of ourselves ;
 but our sufficiency is from

" of ourselves " (ἀπ' ἑαυτῶν) are found in some authorities after " not that we are sufficient," in others after " to think anything " (" to think anything of ourselves, as from ourselves "), in others again before " we are sufficient " (" not that of ourselves we are sufficient "). The last is the order in B & C Copt., and is most probably right.

Whether we understand the Apostle to speak of the inability of himself and his companions *without the grace of God* to think of anything or do anything that would be efficacious in the preaching of the Gospel, or as the unrestricted form of the statement seems to require, of their inability to think in a *salutary way* of anything whatever, in either case the necessity of grace follows from the verse ; for even in the former view it may be fairly concluded that if the Apostles without grace could do nothing in the way of efficacious preaching, *a pari* without it their hearers could do nothing in the way of efficacious hearing ; in other words, without grace they could not assent to the Gospel preached to them. But, as we have said, the wider and unqualified form of the statement seems to insist directly on the necessity of grace for every salutary thought, all the more so as in the beginning of the next verse the Apostle distinguishes his God-given sufficiency as an Apostle from his God-given sufficiency generally. The verse, then, has always been urged, and rightly, both against the Pelagians, who denied the necessity of grace absolutely ; and against the Semipelagians who denied its necessity for the *beginning* of a salutary work. S. Aug. (De Praedest. Sanct., ii. 5) referring to the present verse says : " Attendant et verba ista perpendant, qui putant ex nobis esse fidei coeptum et ex Deo esse fidei supplementum. Quis enim non videat prius esse cogitare quam credere ? . . . Quod ergo pertinet ad religionem et pietatem, de qua loquebatur Apostolus, si non sumus idonei cogitare aliquid quasi ex nobismet ipsis, sed sufficientia nostra ex Deo est, profecto non sumus idonei credere aliquid quasi ex nobismet ipsis, sed sufficientia nostra, qua credere incipiamus, ex Deo est." And the Second Council of Orange (529 A.D.), quoting John xv. 5 (" without Me you can do nothing ") and the present verse, defined in its seventh canon against the Pelagians : " If any man maintains that by his natural powers he can think

nostra ex Deo est: *Qui et God. *Who also hath made idoneos nos fecit ministros novi us fit ministers of the new testamenti; non littera, sed testament, not in the letter, spiritu: littera enim occidit, but in the spirit. For the letter killeth: but the spirit

anything good, pertaining to the salvation of eternal life, or choose it, or assent to the salutary preaching of the Gospel, without the illumination and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, he is deceived by an heretical spirit."

6. As already noticed, the sufficiency here spoken of is not the same as in the preceding verse ("also made us suffice as ministers"); that was general, this is special. Note in the preceding verse and this, "sufficient," "sufficiency," "suffice," and also "sufficient" in ii. 16; the point of this iteration is obscured in the present verse by our ordinary English rendering "made us fit." "The New Testament" is the new Covenant between God and man inaugurated by Christ, and ratified by His death (hence called a *testament*) in which, instead of the multiplied precepts having no grace attached to them to secure their fulfilment, which marked the old covenant, we have an abundant outpouring of the graces of the Holy Ghost (cf. Heb. viii. 10-12; x. 16; John xvi. 13-14). It is a testament "not of letter, but of Spirit," in the sense just explained.

"For the letter killeth," but the Spirit quickeneth (or "giveth life"). Compare Rom. iv. 15: "For the law worketh wrath," Rom. v. 20: "But the law entered in addition (to concupiscence, v. 12) that the transgression might abound"; also Rom. vii. 7; viii. 2-3. The Mosaic law by increasing men's knowledge of what was wrong made them more culpable if they sinned; besides, on the principle *Nitimar in vetitum*, it often provoked to sin, owing to man's rebellious and corrupt nature since the Fall (Rom. vii. 7). And while it thus increased man's responsibility and led to multiplied transgressions, it had no grace attached to it which might make its fulfilment possible. True, grace was obtainable and was often obtained under the Law, but this was not in virtue of the Law itself but of the merits of the Redeemer to come. Hence although the Law was holy and good in itself (Rom. vii. 12), yet owing to the corruption of man's nature the net result of it, apart from Christ's grace, was increased sin. Why then, it may be asked, did God give it to the Jews? Because of compensating advantages, just as He gives man the power to sin

spiritus autem vivificat. ⁷ Quod si ministratio mortis, litteris deformata in lapidibus, fuit in gloria : ita ut non possent intendere filii Israel in faciem quickeneth. ⁷ Now if the ministratio of death, engraven with letters upon stones, was glorious : so that the children of Israel could not steadfastly

when He gives him free will. The Law kept the Jews apart from heathen nations, and preserved pure and undefiled the monotheistic religion ; and guided by its precepts, with the grace of the Redeemer that was to come, many men in the Old Testament attained to great sanctity. At the same time the imperfection of the old covenant led men to look forward to a better, and so helped to prepare them for Christ's coming and for the Christian dispensation. These few considerations will help to explain both why God gave the Law, and how St. Paul could say, as he does here, that " the letter killeth."

7. In this and the four following verses he declares the superior glory of the new dispensation and of its ministers : the Law, which led to spiritual death, was only letters upon stones, the New Testament is the giving of the Spirit (7-8) ; the Law was unto condemnation, the New Testament is unto justice (9-10) ; the Law was transitory, the New Testament is eternal (11). If, then, the giving of the Law was surrounded with glory, how much more, on these three grounds, shall the preaching of the Gospel be in glory ? That the giving of the Law was surrounded with glory, which shone in the face of Moses, who was God's minister in giving it, see Exod. xxxiv. 29-35 : " And Aaron and the children of Israel seeing the face of Moses horned (' shining '—the Vulgate's '*cornutam* faciem' is responsible for the pictures that we sometimes see of Moses with horns), were afraid to come near " (Exod. xxxiv. 30). As a deduction from this statement that they " were afraid to come near " or perhaps relying upon a tradition, St. Paul says here that they " could not steadfastly behold the face of Moses on account of the glory of his countenance." The last words of the verse : " which is made void " (τὴν καταργουμένην) refer to the glory, and mean that it *was** passing away, was coming to nought. We might render " on account of the glory, *transient* though it was." Though the glory on the face of Moses was only a transient glory, symbolical of

* " Quam Participium *praesentis* etiam inserviat exprimendo Participio *Imperfecti*, quod propriam sibi formam non habet, frequenter fit ut Participium *Præsentis* in narratione adhibeatur de re peracta " (Beef., G. G., p. 376).

Moysi, propter gloriam vultus
eius quae evacuatur: * Quo-
modo non magis ministratio

behold the face of Moses, for
the glory of his countenance,
which is made void: * How
shall not the ministration of
the Spirit be rather in glory?

the transitory character of his ministry and of the covenant in which he ministered, yet it was so great that the Jews could not look steadfastly upon it. If such was the case, how much greater must be the glory, even though it be spiritual and not sensible, that surrounds the giving of the new Law, the preaching of the Gospel!

We take διακονία with the Vulgate ("ministratio," not as usually "ministerium"), of the *actual giving* of the Law and of the Gospel in vv. 7, 8, 9, not of the ministry, or *office* of Moses and of the preachers of the Gospel. Διακονία certainly can bear such a meaning (ix. 1; 1 Cor. xvi. 15); while if it be understood here, as Estius and Cornely understand it, of the *office* of the ministers, it is impossible to give any fair explanation of the opening words of this verse: ἡ διακονία . . . ἐντετυπωμένη, "the *office* of the ministers . . . engraved, etc."! But if the reference is to the *actual giving* of the Law, then the manner of that giving is described in the words "engraven with letters upon stones." Moreover, the reference to the brightness on the face of Moses, naturally suggests the actual giving of the tables of the Law, when that brightness appeared. The *Revised Version*, in harmony with our view, has "ministration," not ministry, in the three verses.

8. The general sense of this verse is evident from what has been said on the preceding. "The Spirit" is the Holy Ghost (cf. v. 3, "the Spirit of the living God"), and "the ministration of the Spirit" is the preaching of the Gospel, through which the Holy Ghost is given to men. Moses, then, gave letters engraven on stones; Paul and his companions gave the Holy Ghost in the living hearts of men (v. 3). How much greater, then, must be the glory that surrounds the preaching of the Gospel! The future *fora* is used either because he is turning from the Old Testament to the New, or because much of the preaching of the Gospel still remained to be done.

9. This enforces the *a fortiori* argument of v. 8. The Law referred to by metonymy as "death" in v. 7, is now referred to as "condemnation," the sense being that it was the *occasion*

spiritus erit in gloria? ⁹ Nam si ministratio damnationis gloria est: multo magis abundat ministerium iustitiae in gloria. ¹⁰ Nam nec glorificatum est quod claruit in hac parte, propter excellentem gloriam.

⁹ For if the ministration of condemnation be glory, much more the ministration of justice aboundeth in glory. ¹⁰ For even that which was glorious in this part was not glorified, by reason of the glory that ex-

(while man's corrupt nature was the cause, Rom. vii. 8-11) of death and condemnation. The Greek has no verb expressed in the first clause, but the context shows clearly that the Vulg. "est" is wrong; it ought to be "fuit." The first ἡ δίκαια more probably ought to be replaced by the dative: "for if to the ministration of condemnation (there was) glory." Note that in the last clause here the glory referred to in the preceding verse as future, is now spoken of as present—"aboundeth." It shone on the preaching of the Gospel in the beginning, as it shall shine on it throughout the Church's history.

10. Καὶ γὰρ introduces a new thought, which, however, enforces (γὰρ) what has been said. The change to the neuter τὸ δειδοξασμένον ("that which was glorious") instead of ἡ δίκαια is probably made because he wishes to cover all that was glorified at the giving of the Law, not merely the ministration of the Law itself, but also the ministry of Moses, and the covenant of which he was minister. All were glorified in the glory that surrounded the giving of the Law. The sense of the verse is that in comparison with the glory attaching to the preaching of the Gospel, the Christian ministry and the New Dispensation, no glory attached to the giving of the Law, the ministry of Moses or the Old Dispensation. "At night the light of a lamp appears very bright, but at noon it is hidden and seems not to be a light at all" (Theod.). We might have expected aorists here instead of the perfects δειδόασται and δειδοξασμένον; probably the perfects are due to the LXX. text of Exod. xxxiv. 29, 35.

"In this part," rather "in this instance" (cf. ix. 3) of the giving of the Law. The words, we believe, are to be connected, as the collocation suggests, not with the verb, but with the clause "that which was glorious"; that which was glorious in this instance, was not (really) glorious, when compared with (ἐνεκεν, lit. "on account of") the surpassing glory of the preaching of the Gospel, the Christian ministry, and the New Dispensation. Others, connecting with the verb, take "in this part" equal

¹¹ Si enim quod evacuatur, per gloriam est : multo magis quod manet, in gloria est. ¹² Habentes igitur talem spem, multa

celleth. ¹¹ For if that which is done away was glorious, much more that which remaineth is in glory. ¹² Having therefore

"in this respect," which would then be explained by what follows : was not really made glorious in this respect (namely) on account of the surpassing, etc. But the former view seems preferable, as the clause is not to be connected with the verb, but with the participle.

11. As verse 9 illustrates and enforces v. 8, so does this verse, verse 10 ; note *ei yóp* in both cases. "For if that which was *transient* (lit. 'was coming to nought') was through glory, much more that which is permanent is (and shall be—the Greek has no verb expressed) in glory." The "much more" here is emphatic, and meant to support the strong statement of v. 10, that all that was glorified at the giving of the Law had no glory in comparison with the things corresponding to them in the New Dispensation. Some press the prepositions *διὰ* and *ἐν*, as if "through glory" implied transiency ; "in glory," permanency, and undoubtedly they sometimes imply this (cf. Rom. v. 10) ; yet, as the ministration of the Law was said above, in v. 7, to be in glory, though that glory was declared in the same verse to be coming to nought, we cannot press the distinction here with confidence. The things referred to are *permanent*, because the Christian Dispensation is final, never to be supplanted by another.

12. "Such hope" is the hope of greater glory founded upon the superior excellence of the New Dispensation, as set forth in vv. 7-11.

"We use much confidence" (R.V. "great boldness of speech"). The Greek word for "confidence" here is not the same as in v. 4. *Παρόρησις* (from *πᾶν* and *ῥῆσις*) means literally a *speaking out everything*, without concealing anything. St. Chrysostom gives the sense here : "We speak everywhere with freedom, concealing nothing, hiding nothing, dissembling nothing, but speaking clearly ; nor are we afraid lest we should wound your eyes, as Moses dazzled the eyes of the Jews." "We" means himself and his companions or perhaps all the preachers of the Gospel.

13. Something is required to complete the sense : "And not as Moses put a veil upon his face, etc."—*not so do we act*. The Apostle proceeds to interpret the symbolic meaning of Moses' action on the occasion of the giving of the Law. The passage is

fiducia utimur : ¹³ Et non sicut such hope, we use much confidence : ¹³ And not as Moses
 Moyses ponebat velamen super put a veil upon his face that

obscure. The account of Moses veiling himself is given in Exod. xxxiv. 33-35. Many of the Fathers and commentators suppose that he was veiled when addressing the people, but in the present Hebrew, LXX. and Vulg. text of Exod. xxxiv. 33, it is clearly implied that he was unveiled when he first addressed the people after coming down from Sinai with the tables of the Law on this occasion. In Exod. xxxiv. 35, indeed, according to the Vulg. and Douay Versions, he is said to have been veiled (apparently on subsequent occasions) as often as he spoke to them : " he covered his face again, if at any time he spoke to them " ; but both the present Hebrew and the LXX. text of this verse give a different sense : " he covered his face again *until* he went in to speak with Him " (the Lord). The Hebrew has וַיִּכְסֶה פָּנָיו לְפָנֵי יְהוָה and the LXX. ἔως ὅν ἐστράθη συλλαλεῖν αὐτῷ. It is clear from the account in Exodus that Moses was unveiled as often as he spoke with the Lord ; it seems to us more probable that he was unveiled too as often as he spoke to the people, but that as soon as he had finished speaking to them he put on the veil and wore it until he had to speak to them again or speak with the Lord. There is nothing in the present passage of St. Paul to oblige us to hold that Moses was veiled *when speaking* to the people, though we admit that that would be the view more obviously suggested by the passage. But there seems to be sufficient foundation for the Apostle's symbolism in the fact that Moses was veiled at times *on the occasion*, even though unveiled when speaking. If we suppose the brightness on the face of Moses to have been fading away gradually (v. 7) after he left the presence of the Lord, then we may take it that after he addressed the people he put on the veil, that the people might not see the final disappearance of the brightness.

" That the children of Israel might not steadfastly look, etc." Cornely and others hold that πρὸς τὸ μὴ does not denote a purpose here but a consequence. We doubt this, for the context seems to prove that while St. Paul and his fellow-preachers of the Gospel have nothing to hide and can therefore act with freedom and confidence, Moses, or God acting through him, had something to hide. Moses put on the veil, then, by Divine impulse, *in order to* hide that something. The purpose here expressed may

faciem suam, ut non intenderent filii Israel in faciem eius, the children of Israel might not steadfastly look on the face of that which is made void.

possibly not be that of Moses, but the Divine purpose which St. Paul sees to have lain in the symbolical act of Moses veiling himself under a Divine impulse.

"On the face of that which is made void." "Face" and "faciem" (Vulg.) are certainly wrong, and must be replaced by "end" (τέλος) and "finem," all the Greek MSS. except A, and all the Fathers, Latin as well as Greek, reading "end." The sense is: Moses put a veil upon his face, that the children of Israel might not look steadfastly on the end of that which was passing away, i.e., on the fading away of the brightness, and passing away of the Old Covenant which that fading symbolised. Τέλος is thus equal to "termination" or "disappearance"—its natural meaning when there is question of something that was *passing away*; and that which was passing away was the brightness on the face of Moses (as in v. 7), the evanescent character of that brightness, however, symbolising the evanescent character of the Mosaic ministry and of the Old Dispensation. The neuter τοῦ καταργουμένου is used instead of the feminine, because there is question not merely of the passing of the brightness (τὴν δόξαν . . . τὴν καταργουμένην, v. 7), but also of all that it symbolised.

Others take quite a different view of the latter part of the verse, understanding "that which was passing away" to refer directly to the Old Covenant (cf. v. 11), and "the end" to refer to Christ (cf. Rom. x. 4). Moses, they say, put a veil upon his face, *his* intention being to spare the eyes of the Jews the dazzling brightness, but God intended thereby to signify *this result*, namely, that the Jews would not look steadfastly upon, so as to recognise, Christ, who was at once the termination of the Mosaic Law and the goal towards which it pointed (τὸ τέλος). But the former view seems more natural and in every way better.

The sum of what the Apostle says, then, is that the veil on Moses was meant to prevent the Jews of that time from looking steadfastly on, and reading the import of, the fading away of the brightness from his face. God did not wish to reveal to them then the transient character of the Old Covenant. There was an excuse for their not seeing then that the Old Covenant was transient; it was different now after God had revealed the fact through the Prophets and declared it openly through the Apostles.

quod evacuatur, ¹⁴ Sed obtusi sunt sensus eorum. Usque in hodiernum enim diem idipsum velamen in lectione veteris testamenti manet non revelatum (quoniam in Christo evacuatur). ¹⁵ Sed usque in

¹⁴ But their senses were made dull. For until this present day, the self-same veil, in the reading of the old testament, remaineth not taken away (because in Christ it is made void). ¹⁵ But even until this

14. Though the preachers of the Gospel wear no veil, but clearly proclaim the abolition of the Old Covenant, yet the Jews still refuse to accept the fact. "But their senses were made dull." Here we have the explanation of their refusal. The sons of Israel, the Jewish race, hardened their hearts *in days gone by* (the aorist seems to mean this), and that this hardening continues still, the Apostle declares in the words that follow. Παροὺν wherever it occurs in the New Testament (Mark vi. 52, viii. 17; John xii. 40; Rom. xi. 7, the only other passages besides this), is always used of a *culpable* hardening or blindness. On the Greek word for "senses" here, see above on ii. 11. "Minds" would be a better rendering here. Their minds were dulled and darkened through their own fault. "For, until this present day, etc." He does not mean of course "the same veil" numerically, but the same in effect, preventing them from seeing that the Old Covenant is abolished. At the reading of the Old Testament, this veil remains unlifted, for (only) in Christ, through faith in Him, is it taken away (and in Him the Jews refuse to believe).

Others, with less probability, take the end of the verse to mean that the same veil remains, it (the fact) not being unveiled or manifested to them that the Old Covenant is done away, or abolished in Christ. This is grammatically admissible, taking μὴ ἀνακαλυπτόμενον as an accus. absol., but the other view is more natural, nor is there any serious difficulty in understanding καταργεῖν in reference to the removal of a veil of culpable unbelief. Note how the name "Old Testament" is given to the books of the Old Covenant, and that "Old" is doubtless intended to mark that the "New" had come.

15. A resumption and development of the preceding, stating where the veil rests now: not on the face of Moses or of the preachers of the Gospel, but upon the hearts of the Jews.

"When Moses is read" is merely an explanation of "at the reading of the Old Testament" (v. 14), just as the statement that the veil lies upon their hearts is a further explanation of the

hodiernum diem, cum legitur Moyses, velamen positum est super cor eorum. ¹³ Cum autem conversus fuerit ad Dominum, day when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart: ¹⁴ But when they shall be converted to the Lord, the veil shall be

statement there that it still remains unlifted. The allusion is to the public reading of the Old Testament in the Jewish synagogues every Sabbath, and as the Prophets were read as well as the Law, Moses stands for the entire Old Testament, unless it be that the Apostle restricts his reference to the books of Moses, because he had been speaking of him.

16. It is not clear what is the subject of the sentence, Israel, or Moses, or their heart. The words evidently allude to Exod. xxxiv. 34: "But when Moses went in before the Lord to speak with Him, he took the veil off," ἦνίκα δ' ὃν εἰσπορεύετο Μωϋσῆς ἐναντὶ Κυρίου λαλεῖν αὐτῷ, περιηρείτο τὸ κάλυμμα (LXX.). The allusion cannot be doubted, especially when we know that St. Paul has had the passage of Exod. in his mind in the preceding verses, and when we remark that ἦνίκα is not found anywhere else in the New Testament except in this and the preceding verse, where it is evidently taken up from the passage of Exodus which we have just quoted.

What, then, is the subject of the sentence? Not Israel, for "Israel" in v. 13 is not the nation but the Patriarch; nor "the children of Israel," for the verb is in the singular number. Possibly Moses, the Apostle recalling Moses unveiled whenever he turned to the Lord, and leaving it to be inferred that the veil of the Jews would also be removed whenever they turned to the Lord; yet in that case we should rather expect a past tense instead of the present περιηρείται. Most probably, then, "their heart" (cf. v. 15) is the subject. And since in the LXX. text of Exod. xxxiv. 34 given above, the verb περιηρείτο has a middle signification: "he (Moses) took off the veil from himself," probably the verb has a middle sense here also, and we may render the verse: "but whensoever it ('their heart') turn to the Lord, it taketh away from itself the veil"—the veil of culpable unbelief, which hid from it the abolition of the Old Covenant and the advent of the Messiah. For "conversus" of Vulg. read "conversum" in agreement with "cor"; and for "auferetur" "aufertur," or if the Greek verb has really a middle sense here, "aufert."

17. The subject here is "the Lord," not "the Spirit," for the Apostle evidently wishes to say who is the Lord of whom

auferetur velamen. ¹⁷ Dominus autem Spiritus est : ubi autem Spiritus Domini, ibi libertas. ¹⁸ Nos vero omnes, revelata facie gloriam Domini speculan-

taken away. ¹⁷ Now the Lord is a Spirit. And where, the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. ¹⁸ But we all beholding the glory of the Lord with open

he has just spoken, to whom they are to turn. *Tò πνεῦμα* cannot be taken adjectivally, as some have taken it, understanding the sense to be that Christ is spiritual (cf. John iv. 24) ; the article, as the Greek Fathers insisted, forbids such a view, and we must render : " Now the Lord is the Spirit." And since one Divine Person cannot be said to be another, " the Lord " here cannot refer to Christ (if the reference were to Him, He would be called Christ, as in v. 14), but must refer to Jahveh, the Deity. The Lord then, to whom they are to turn, is the Spirit, already referred to several times in this chapter, who wrote on the hearts of the Corinthians (v. 3), who quickeneth (v. 6), whose ministration was to be more glorious (v. 8) ; not therefore Jahveh revealed amid thunder and lightning as on Sinai, but the Lord as the Spirit of love and life.

" But where the Spirit of the Lord is (there), is liberty." The Holy Ghost who has just been declared to be identical with Jahveh, is now called " the Spirit of (the) Lord," apparently in allusion to His Procession from the Father and the Son. Some have conjectured that *κυρίου* here ought to be *κύριον*, agreeing with *πνεῦμα* : " but where the Spirit-Lord is, etc." ; but there is no external evidence to support the conjecture. The " liberty " referred to is freedom from slavery to the Mosaic Law (cf. Rom. vii. 6 ; viii. 2), which the Jews will see to be abolished, if they turn to the Lord and put aside the veil of unbelief ; not a license to sin, for the Apostle says elsewhere that we are not to make our liberty an occasion to the flesh (Gal. v. 13).

18. Here the thought of v. 12 is resumed, after the digressions suggested by the mention of the veil of Moses ; but the superior glory of the New Dispensation is now considered not merely in its effect upon the preachers, but more probably upon all the faithful. Such seems to be the more natural sense of " but we all," though Estius and others prefer to hold that only all the ministers of the Gospel are meant, and point with some force to iv. 1 in support of their view. However, iv. 1 may be naturally explained, even if the present verse refers to the glorious privileges of all Christians.

tes, in eandem imaginem transformamur a claritate in claritatem, tamquam a Domini Spiritu.

face, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, as by the Spirit of the Lord.

We prefer to understand *κατοπτρίζμενοι*, with the Greek Fathers of *reflecting as a mirror*, rather than *beholding as in a mirror*. The latter brings out the idea of our mediate and imperfect knowledge of God (cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 12), an idea correct of course in itself, but hardly to be expected here where the Apostle is extolling the glory of the New Dispensation. Moreover, there seems to be a contrast between Moses reflecting the glory of the Lord with face veiled at times, and Christians reflecting it with unveiled face. Christians reflect in their lives the glory of the Lord that shines upon them in the Gospel and in the manifold graces of the Holy Ghost. Moses put on a veil to hide the evanescent character of the glory of the Old Covenant, but Christians have no fear that the glory of the New Dispensation is transient, and hence they are said, in the figurative language of the Apostle, to reflect it, "with face unveiled."

As already implied, others understand of *beholding as in a mirror* the glory of God shining in the Gospel (cf. iv. 4), and take "with open (unveiled) face" in contrast not with the veiled face of Moses, but with the veiled heart of the Jews (v. 15). But if that had been intended, the Apostle would surely have written "heart" instead of "face" here. Besides, for the reasons already set forth, the former view appears more probable.

"Are transformed into the same image from glory to glory." *Εἰκόνα*, after a verb of change needs no preposition to govern it (cf. Grimm, *Lex.* on *μεταμορφόω*) though some understand *κατά* ("according to"), cf. Col. iii. 10. The meaning is that Christians, reflecting without any fear of its fading away the glory of the Lord that shines upon them in and through the Gospel, are continually being transformed. A lifeless mirror is not really transformed by reflecting the light that shines upon it, but *living* mirrors, such as St. Paul speaks of, may well be transformed by the glory of God shining upon them. "Into the same image." The "image" is the likeness of the Deity reproduced in the spiritual character of Christians; all, however different in character, are transformed into "the same" likeness. Or the "likeness" may be the likeness of God in Christ, who is called the

show of God in iv. 4 (cf. Col. i. 15), and Christians would then be said to be transformed according to that Divine likeness.

"From glory to glory." For the Vulg. "a claritate in claritatem," better: "a gloria in gloriam." The simplest view of these words is that they imply a constant progression in the spiritual condition of Christians; though others prefer to understand: from glory received from the Lord to glory that is our own. There are also several other views.

"As by the Spirit of the Lord." The Greek may be rendered "as from the Lord of the Spirit," or "as from the Spirit of the Lord," or "as from the Lord, the Spirit," or finally, since both words are without the article, "as from a Lord-Spirit," i.e., as from a Divine Spirit. The last seems best. The change wrought in Christians is such as comes worthily from a Divine Spirit. "The Lord" has been identified with "the Spirit" in v. 17, where both nouns have the article, and the transformation is naturally referred to now as being such as becomes a transformation that has a Divine Spirit as its source.

Of the other renderings, the third defended by the Greek Fathers is practically the same as ours; the second followed by the Latin Fathers is not improbable, but the first is commonly rejected by Catholics.

CHAPTER IV

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

Mindful of their glorious ministry, the Apostle and his companions faint not in their work, but by their conduct and their manner of preaching commend themselves to all honest men (vv. 1-2), and the fault is not theirs if many refuse to receive the Gospel (3-4). They preached Jesus Christ as Lord, because God had called them to spread the knowledge of the glory of God, as that glory was revealed in Christ (5-6). But though discharging this exalted ministry, they were weak, mortal men, subjected to tribulations of all kinds, so that it might be evident that the exceeding greatness of the power of the Gospel was of God and not from men (7-12). Yet amid all their tribulations, they preached the Gospel boldly, knowing by faith that a glorious resurrection awaited their converts and themselves (13-14), and that God's glory was promoted by their labours (15). Strong in this faith, they fainted not; but though their bodies were decaying, their spiritual nature was quickened and renewed, as they looked to the eternal reward which temporary tribulation would merit (16-18).

¹ IDEO habentes administrationem, iuxta quod misericordiam consecuti sumus non deficimus. ² Sed abdicamus occulta dedecoris, non ambulantes in astutia, neque adul-

¹ THEREFORE seeing we have this ministration, according as we have obtained mercy, we faint not. ² But we renounce the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness, nor

1. "Therefore." The connection with the preceding is: since such is the happy and glorious condition of all Christians, *therefore* we the ministers of the Christian Gospel faint not. *Ταύτην* must be read after *δικοκλίον*, "*this office*" of Apostle or "*this ministration*," i.e., the announcing to men of this glorious Gospel of the New Covenant. The ministers of such a Gospel could not be ashamed of it, nor timid or despondent.

The words "according as we obtained mercy," which allude to the gratuitous call to preach the Gospel, are probably to be connected with the preceding, not with the following, words of the verse. If connected with the following, the sense would be: we faint not, but do our best according to the measure of the call that was given us.

2. "But we renounce." The Greek verb is in the first aorist

terantes verbum Dei, sed in manifestatione veritatis commendantes nosmetipsos ad omnem conscientiam hominum coram Deo. ³ Quod si etiam opertum est evangelium nostrum : in iis qui pereunt est opertum : ⁴ In quibus Deus

adulterating the word of God, but by manifestation of the truth commending ourselves to every man's conscience, in the sight of God. ³ And if our gospel be also hid ; it is hid to them that are lost, ⁴ In whom the god of this world hath

middle, but it has the force of a present here, as in Vulg. and Douay Versions ; cf. Estius.

“ The hidden things of shame ” (not “ dishonesty ”). We may naturally suppose the Apostle to refer here to the general conduct of the Gospel ministers as well as to their manner of preaching. The lofty character of their ministry ought to affect their conduct as well as their preaching, and he may be reasonably supposed to say that it did. “ The hidden things of shame,” therefore, probably cover everything, whether in conduct or preaching, of which they would have reason to be ashamed, everything that shame leads men to conceal (“ ea quae pudor celat,” as Grimm on ἀποκρύβη explains the present phrase) ; their “ not walking in craftiness ” refers to their conduct ; “ not adulterating, etc.,” to their manner of preaching ; while the concluding words : “ by the manifestation of the truth, etc.,” standing in opposition to both the preceding clauses, are to be taken as a manifestation through both their life and preaching.

“ In the sight of God.” Connect with “ commending ourselves.” The Gospel ministers acted and taught in a way calculated to win the approval of all men of conscience, but the thought that God was looking on was always paramount. This seems better than to take the words, as some do, as an asseveration *before God* of the truth of what he has just said.

3. If, then, this glorious Gospel (iii. 6-18) was so worthily preached (iv. 2), why, it might be asked, did not all receive it, why was its glory “ veiled ” from many ? The substance of his reply is that the fault was not in the Gospel nor in its ministers but in “ those who are perishing ” by blindness and unbelief induced by Satan through their own fault. Κατακλυμμένον looks back to the veil (κάλυμμα) on the face of Moses (iii. 13), and on the hearts of the Jews (iii. 15).

4. “ The god of this world ” is Satan, whom Christ called “ the prince of this world ” (John xii. 31 ; xiv. 30 ; xvi. 11) and whom St. Paul calls elsewhere “ the prince of the power of the air ”

huius saeculi excaecavit mentes infidelium, ut non fulgeat illis illuminatio evangelii gloriae Christi, qui est imago Dei. blinded the minds of unbelievers, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should

(Eph. ii. 2). "This world"—rather "this age" (τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου) is to be taken in a bad sense of the wicked and unbelieving world, as so often in St. Paul (Rom. xii. 2; 1 Cor. i. 20; ii. 6, 8; Gal. i. 4; 2 Tim. iv. 10, etc.), and Satan is called its god, because it treats and serves him as such, recognising no other god. To some men their belly is their god (Phil. iii. 19), and to the wicked world Satan is its god.

As the Manicheans abused this passage to support their heresy that there is a Supreme Evil Being as well as a Supreme Good Being, a *Summum Malum* as well as a *Summum Bonum*, the former the author of the Old Testament and ruler of the present world, the latter author of the New Testament and ruler of the world to come, many of the Fathers explained the passage of the true God, either holding that St. Paul here calls Him the God of this world to imply that God can be known from the visible world or inverting the order of the words and understanding the meaning to be: "in whom God blinded the minds of the unbelieving of this world." But both explanations are as forced as they are unnecessary, and there is no doubt that the reference is to Satan. Hence read "deus" without a capital in Vulg.

In the case of those who were perishing, then, Satan blinded the minds "of the unbelievers" (τῶν ἀπιστῶν). The sense is well given by Estius: *Obvelatum est evangelium nostrum iis qui pereunt, hoc est, iis infidelibus, quorum mentes hujus saeculi deus, id est, diabolus excaecavit.* All those were perishing who disbelieved the Gospel, that is, who positively rejected it; but they were only one class "of the unbelievers," or non-Christians, for there was another class, those namely whom Satan failed to blind, and who received the Gospel when preached to them. This explanation agrees with the natural meaning of τῶν ἀπιστῶν, "those without faith," whether the Gospel had been preached to them or not.

"That the light of the Gospel, etc." Satan's object in blinding them was that the light of the Gospel, which Gospel sets forth the glory of Christ, might not shed its effulgence upon them. Φωτισμός seems to mean light here, as in LXX. of Ps. xxvii. 1; xliii. 4, etc., where it represents the Hebrew נֹר (light), though

* Non enim nosmetipsos prae- not shine unto them. * For we
dicamus, sed IESUM CHRISTUM preach not ourselves, but
Dominum nostrum : nos autem JESUS CHRIST our Lord : and
servos vestros per IESUM : ourselves your servants through
* Quoniam Deus qui dixit de JESUS. * For God, who com-
tenebris lucem splendescere, manded the light to shine out

below in verse 6 it is used in its strict sense of illumination, " the giving of light."

" Who is the image of God " (cf. Col. i. 15). " That anything be a perfect image," says St. Thomas, " three things are required, and these three are in Christ perfectly : similitude, dependence of origin, perfect equality. For if between an image and him of whom it is an image there were dissimilitude, or if one did not spring from the other, also if there were not perfect equality, there would not be a perfect image. For the likeness of a king on a penny is not a perfect image, because there is wanting equality of nature, but the likeness of a king in his son is called a perfect image, because the three things mentioned are present. Since then these three are in Christ the Son of God, seeing that He is like the Father, proceeds from the Father, and is equal to the Father, He is the perfect image of God." In calling Christ the image of God, the Apostle traces the light of the Gospel to its ultimate source ; the world is illumined by the preachers of the Gospel, these by Christ, and Christ as God—and it is of His Divine nature there is question—is the " *Lumen de Lumine*," the uncreated effulgence of the Father (cf. Heb. i. 3).

5. Some take verses 3, 4 as parenthetic, and connect the present verse with " commending ourselves, etc.," of verse 2 ; but it is simpler to understand the Apostle to be explaining why he spoke in the preceding verse of " the Gospel of the glory of Christ," as if he said : for it is that we preach, not ourselves. The Vulg. " nostrum " (" our ") must be omitted ; the sense is : but we preach Jesus Christ as Lord, *Kύριον* being the predicate.

" And ourselves your servants, etc." We are not to understand that the office or condition of the Apostles was a secondary subject of their preaching, but a new verb is to be supplied : " but we *regard* ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake " (*Ὡς ἡμεῖς αὐτοὺς*).

6. They preached Christ and not themselves, because the Author of primeval light had called and prepared them to spread the light of the knowledge of God by preaching the Gospel of

ipse illuxit in cordibus nostris,
ad illuminationem scientiæ
claritatis Dei, in facie CHRISTI
IESU.

of darkness, hath shined in our
hearts, to give the light of the
knowledge of the glory of God
in the face of CHRIST JESUS.

Christ. The Divine will was the norm and guiding principle of their preaching.

The best supported reading gives the sense : " for God who said, Light shall shine (λάμψει) out of darkness (is He) who shone (ὃς ἔλαμπεν) in our hearts." The reference is of course to the hearts and minds of the preachers of the Gospel. But it is disputed whether the words that follow : " to give the light of the knowledge, etc.," are to be understood of giving the light to the preachers themselves or of their giving it to the world. The former is the view of the Greek Fathers, but the latter is more in harmony with the context : we preach Jesus Christ as Lord and recognise ourselves as your servants, because God gave us the light of faith and made us preachers of the Gospel that we might shed upon others the light (Eph. iii. 9) of the knowledge of the glory (τῆς δόξης) of God, as reflected in the face of Christ, who is God's image (v. 4).

" In the face of Christ " (omit Ἰησοῦ). Estius strenuously maintains that here, as well as in i. 11, ii. 10, προσώπων is to be understood in the sense of " person," not " face " ; and he takes the meaning to be that God shone in their hearts, that they in the person of Christ, i.e., as His representatives and with His authority, might bring the light of the knowledge of God to others. But it seems more probable that προσώπων ought to be taken here in the sense of " face," as it is throughout the rest of this passage (iii. 7, 13, 18). The invisible glory of God, made known to men in Christ His image is meant, and Christ's face is specially mentioned in allusion to the glory on the face of Moses (iii. 13). Or if προσώπων were to be understood in the sense of " person " here, we might explain that God shone in the hearts of Paul and his companions, that they might make known the glory of God, as it was revealed in the person of Christ. It is no objection against this latter view that the article is wanting before ἐν προσώπῳ, but ought to be expressed (τῆς ἐν προσώπῳ) in order to bring out the apposition, for St. Paul sometimes omits the article in similar cases (cf. Rom. vi. 4 ; 1 Cor. ii. 7 ; x. 18 ; Eph. iii. 4).

⁷ Habemus autem thesaurum istum in vasis fictilibus : ut sublimitas sit virtutis Dei : et non ex nobis. ⁸ In omnibus tribulationem patimur, sed non angustiamur : aporiamur, sed non destituimur : ⁹ Persecutionem patimur, sed non derelin-

⁷ But we have this treasure in earthen vessels, that the excellency may be of the power of God, and not of us. ⁸ In all things we suffer tribulation, but are not distressed : we are straitened, but are not destitute : ⁹ We suffer persecution,

7. He now points out in vv. 7-12 the contrast, introduced by *ἐξ*, between their exalted office and their own weakness and fragility.

The "treasure" is the exalted office which they held. "Earthen vessels," i.e., made of clay, and hence fragile. The metaphor signifies the weakness and fragility of human nature, and not merely of the body, for in what follows "perplexed, but not despairing" (v. 8) refers to the mind. God had provided that the ministers of this glorious Gospel should be weak, mortal men, that the exceeding greatness of the power (of the Gospel) might be seen to be of God and not from themselves (cf. 1 Cor. ii. 4, 5).

8. Verse 7 is now illustrated (8-12) by a series of antitheses, the first member in each setting forth the weakness of the Gospel preachers, the second the power of God. The original has present participles, signifying that the condition described was continual.

"In all things we suffer tribulation, but are not distressed." *Θάβω* may cover afflictions of all kinds (Mark iii. 9 ; John xvi. 21 ; 2 Cor. viii. 13 ; Matt. xxiv. 21, 29 ; Rom. ii. 9 ; viii. 35), and probably this first member is general, those that follow giving particular instances. "Not distressed" is hardly a happy rendering. The idea is that God always *made room* for them and gave them a way out of the worst trials—not straitened or not cornered. "We are straitened, but are not destitute." Rather : "perplexed, but not unto despair." Note in the original *ἀπορούμενοι, ἐξαπορούμενοι*. "Perfective *ἐξ* shows the *ἀπορία* in its final result of despair" (J. H. Moulton, *Proleg.*, p. 237).

9. "Not forsaken," i.e., by God. Or if, as is not improbable, *διωκόμενοι* ought to get the sense of "pursued," the imagery representing a flight before enemies, *οὐκ ἔγκοιτα*, would then mean "not left behind as a prey to our pursuers" (Herod. viii. 59).—"Cast down" does not refer to mental depression ; it means "thrown down" as in wrestling (Plutarch, *Pericl.* 8) or "struck

quimur : delicismur, sed non perimus : ¹⁰ Semper mortificationem IESU in corpore nostro circumferentes, ut et vita IESU manifestetur in corporibus nostris. ¹¹ Semper enim nos, qui vivimus, in mortem tradimur

but are not forsaken : we are cast down, but we perish not : ¹⁰ Always bearing about in our body the mortification of JESUS, that the life also of JESUS may be made manifest in our bodies. ¹¹ For we who

down as by a dart " (Xen. Cyr. i. 3, 14). The language is of course metaphorical, and the chief, though not exclusive, reference would seem to be to bodily suffering.

10. "The mortification of Jesus." Νέκρωσις is used only once elsewhere in the New Testament, Rom. iv. 19, where it describes the dead condition of the aged Sara's womb. Some would render here also by "deadness," as if he said, we are living corpses on account of the constant proximity of death. But it is better to understand of "the dying" or "putting to death" of Jesus (cf. vi. 9 : "as dying and behold we live"), in the sense that their constant afflictions and exposure to death represented and, as it were, repeated the dying of Jesus, i.e., His most extreme suffering (cf. xi. 23 ; 1 Cor. xv. 31).

"That the life also of Jesus, etc." God, in permitting those dangers, intended that Paul and his companions, by escaping from them, should show forth and manifest to men the glorious and immortal life of Jesus, through whom they were rescued from every peril. There is no reference to manifestation of the life of Jesus in their bodies in Heaven, for the next verse, which evidently explains this, shows that there is question of their mortal bodies, and we know that mortal bodies cannot enter Heaven, for "flesh and blood cannot possess the kingdom of God," and before entering it "this mortal must put on immortality" (1 Cor. xv. 50, 53).

11. This explains what is meant by "the dying of Jesus" and what by the manifestation of His life in the preceding verse. The "dying" consisted in a continual exposure to death, and the manifestation of Jesus' life was a manifestation to be made in their mortal flesh, i.e., in their bodies while here on earth.—Ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες does not mean "those of us who still survive," as opposed to those already put to death, like James the Greater, for that would be a needless qualification ; the words are used to throw into prominence the paradox that in the midst of life they were being continually delivered unto death. "For Jesus'

propter IESUM : ut et vita IESU manifestetur in carne nostra mortali. ¹² Ergo mors in nobis operatur, vita autem in vobis.

¹³ Habentes autem eundem spiritum fidei, sicut scriptum est : Credidi propter quod locutus sum : et nos credimus, propter quod et loquimur :

live are always delivered unto death for JESUS' sake : that the life also of JESUS may be made manifest in our mortal flesh. = So then death worketh in us, but life in you.

¹³ But having the same spirit of faith, as it is written : *I believed, for which cause I have spoken* : we also believe, for which cause we speak also :

sake " expresses a new thought, and is not to be taken as parallel to " the dying of Jesus," as if the latter meant a dying for Jesus' sake, for " the life of Jesus," which is contrasted with His dying, is not a life for His sake, but the life that He Himself lives. Hence the dying too is His, but reproduced, in the sense already explained, in the lives of the Apostle and his companions.

12. From verse 7 he has dwelt upon the thought that the natural weakness and sufferings of himself and his companions, when taken in conjunction with their continuous escape from all dangers, set forth the power of God and pointed to Christ as still living. A new thought now enters in—that of the spiritual fruit derived by their converts from their tribulations and dangers. " Death " is again physical death, or rather the dangers that threatened to induce it, but " life " now seems to be at least chiefly spiritual life. Both the continually preserved physical life of the teachers and the spiritual life of their converts were the effects of Christ's glorious life, and the Apostle here seems to pass from the one to the other. It is not meant that St. Paul and his companions did not also enjoy the spiritual life, nor that some of their converts did not also encounter physical dangers for their faith, but what was most manifest in each case is dwelt upon—the Gospel meant danger to its ministers, life to their children. It matters nothing to the sense whether we take ἐργάζεται as a middle voice " worketh," or " exerts itself," death and life being thus personified, or as a passive " is wrought." Weighty authorities support each view.

13. The connection with the preceding verse is close : but though there is this contrast between us and you, we go on in confidence, knowing that God will one day reward us with you in the life to come. Thus he passes from the end God had in

14 *Scientes quoniam qui suscitavit IESUM, et nos cum IESU suscitabit, et constituet vobiscum.* 15 *Omnia enim propter vos: ut gratia abundans, per multos in gratiarum actione, abundet in gloriam Dei.*

14 *Knowing that he who raised up JESUS will raise up us also with JESUS, and place us with you.* 15 *For all things are for your sakes: that the grace abounding through many may abound in thanksgiving unto*

view in permitting their sufferings (v. 7) to the end they themselves had in view in enduring them: they look to a glorious resurrection for themselves and their spiritual children (14, 15), and hence they faint not (16) because these temporal tribulations merit for them eternal glory (17, 18).

The sense of the present verse is: But having the same Spirit of faith that is referred to by the Psalmist in the passage: "I believed, therefore I spoke," we also believe, therefore we also speak (the truths of the Gospel). As in the case of the Psalmist, so in that of Paul and his companions, faith in God issued in speech; in the Psalmist's case apparently in thanksgiving for deliverance from danger and sorrow, in that of St. Paul and his companions in fearless proclamation of the Gospel. The reference is to Ps. 116 according to the Hebrew numbering, which corresponds to Pss. 114 and 115 in Vulg., and the verse here quoted is the first in the 115th Ps. of Vulg. St. Paul in the quotation follows LXX. exactly, but the present Hebrew has: "I believed *for* I spoke." However, the difference is not serious, for in both the connection between faith and speech is established, St. Paul arguing from the cause to the effect, the Psalmist, according to the Hebrew, from the effect to the cause.

14. The Apostle speaks here, as in 1 Cor. vi. 14, as if he expected to be dead before the day of judgment. See above on 1 Cor. iii. 15; xv. 51, pp. 43, 257. Probably we ought to read: "Knowing that He who raised up *the Lord Jesus*." "With Jesus" (σὺν Ἰησοῦ) is correct, B X C D E F G P, It., Vulg., Copt., etc., though some ancient authorities have "*through* (διὰ) Jesus." Of course the sense is not: at the same time with Jesus, but: so as to share in His glorious life (cf. xiii. 4; 1 Thess. iv. 16).—"And place us with you," i.e., alive before God. The verb παρστήσει is the same that is used in Acts i. 3: "He showed Himself alive," and in Acts ix. 41: "He presented her alive."

15. In saying "shall place us with you," not you with us, he had shown the great importance of the faithful, as distinct from

¶ Propter quod non deficimus : the glory of God. ¹⁴ For which
sed licet is qui foris est, noster cause we faint not : but though
homo corrumpatur ; tamen is our outward man is corrupted,
qui intus est, renovatur de die yet the inward man is renewed
in diem. ¹⁷ Id enim quod in day by day. ¹⁷ For that which

their teachers, since they must always form the great bulk of the Church's members. He now points out that so great is this importance that all things are for their sakes. Probably the reference is chiefly to all the labours of himself and his companions, but it may be implied that God has ordered all created things (τὰ πάντα) for the sake of the Church (cf. 1 Cor. iii. 22).

"That the grace abounding . . . unto the glory of God." The ultimate end of the labours of St. Paul and his companions was the greater glory of God, and this was to be attained through the spread of the faith and the thanksgiving and salvation to which that spread would lead. Two different Greek verbs are here rendered in our English version by "abound," but the sense is little affected thereby. Both these verbs may be transitive or intransitive, and most likely the first is intransitive here, the second transitive, though the Vulg. takes both intransitively. "Through the many" may be connected either with what goes before or with what follows : that the grace (of the faith) being multiplied through the many (who share it), may cause the thanksgiving to abound unto the Glory of God, or : that the grace being multiplied may cause the thanksgiving to abound through (by means of) the many, etc. For περισσεύω in this transitive sense, see ix. 8 ; 1 Thess. iii. 2 ; Eph. i. 8.

16. Seeing, then, that we hope for a glorious resurrection as the reward of our labours (14), and that these labours conduce to the spread of the Gospel, and so to the glory of God (15), "wherefore we fail not." He here returns to the thought of verse 1.

"The outward man" is the body, with the whole sensitive nature ; "the inward man," the soul, with the whole spiritual nature. The former was losing its vigour and "decaying," owing to its nature, and under the strain of labour and suffering ; but the latter was being renewed and stimulated day by day, as they looked forward to the reward that would crown all these labours and sufferings. That this last thought was in the Apostle's mind, is clear from what follows.

17. Their spiritual nature was quickened and perfected by

praesenti est momentaneum et leve tribulationis nostrae, supra modum in sublimitate aeternum gloriae pondus operatur in nobis. = Non contemplanti-

is at present momentary and light of our tribulation, worketh for us above measure exceedingly an eternal weight of glory. ¹⁸ While we look not at

suffering, because they knew by faith that the passing trials of this life merit eternal glory. From which it is clear that it is not wrong to act with a view to an eternal reward. Hence the Council of Trent, Sess. xi., Can. 26, *De Justif.*, defined: "Si quis dixerit justos non debere pro bonis operibus quae in Deo fuerint facta, expectare et sperare aeternam retributionem a Deo, per ejus misericordiam et Jesu Christi meritum, si bene agendo et divina mandata custodiendo usque in finem perseveraverint, anathema sit."

The *lightness* and *transitoriness* of earthly tribulation is contrasted with the *weight* and *eternity* of the glory it merits. It matters little whether πρόσκαιρον ("momentary," or "lasting a short time") is to be read or omitted after παρὰντίκα. The weight of evidence is against it; but even without it the sense is the same, for παρὰντίκα = "at this moment," opposed as it is to αἰώνιον ("eternal"), must include the idea of *brief* as well as present tribulation.

There is no clearer text than this in the New Testament in favour of the Catholic doctrine that good works really merit *de condigno*, for it states that our present tribulation (endured of course in the proper spirit, as the Apostle supposes) *works* for us an eternal weight of glory, the glory being the *effect* and reward of the tribulation endured. Hence the Council of Trent, Sess. vi., cap. 16, quotes it as proving the meritorious character of good works, warning us at the same time that the fact that our good works can thus merit is due to the mercy of God, "cujus tanta est erga homines bonitas, ut eorum velit esse merita quae sunt ipsius dona."

"Above measure exceedingly" (καθ' ὑπερβολὴν εἰς ὑπερβολήν). This is to be connected with the verb or perhaps with all that follows. It seems the strongest expression the Apostle could invent, and is found only here in the New Testament. Omit "in" before "nobis" in the Vulg. The sense is, as in our English version, "worketh for us," ἡμῖν being the dative of advantage.

18. The Vulgate abl. absol. renders the Greek Gen. absol.; and the sense is: "while or because we look not at the things,

bus nobis quae videntur, sed quae non videntur. Quae enim videntur, temporalia sunt : quae autem non videntur, aeterna sunt.

the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen. For the things which are seen are temporal : but the things which are not seen are eternal.

etc." " He does not say," says St. Chrysostom, " the tribulations are temporal, but *the things which are seen*, all of them, be it chastisement or enjoyment and repose, are temporal ; so that we may be neither discouraged by the one nor overcome by the other. Therefore in speaking of the future, neither does he say, *the kingdom is eternal*, but, *the things which are not seen are eternal*, be it kingdom, or be it punishment, so as to terrify us from the one, and incite us to the other."

CHAPTER V

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

Explicit statement that a glorious body would one day be theirs, should they die (v. 1). This confirmed by the desire they had to put on that body without passing through death (2)—since indeed (whether alive or dead at the day of judgment) they would have bodies afterwards (3). For indeed, though now burthened with fear because they dreaded death, they yet longed for glorious bodies (4); but God who implanted that desire is able and willing that it shall not be frustrated (5). Hence they always had confidence and courage, and did not fear death, which would bring their souls home to Christ (6–8). Thus they strove to be found pleasing to Him, whether alive or dead, when the day of judgment comes (9); for on that day all must be manifested, that each may receive his deserts (10). Mindful of this fearful judgment, they sought to persuade men of their sincerity, which was known to God, and, he hopes, also to the Corinthians (11). This not vain boasting, for in all cases their thought was of God and the Corinthians (12–13). For Christ's love for men constrained them, as they reflected how in Christ's death all died to sin (as far as in Him lay), and how all were henceforth called to live for Him (14–15). Wherefore they judge of all men by new standards; every Christian is a new creature (16–17). This mighty renovation due to God the Father, who sent Christ to redeem men, and the Apostles to complete Christ's work (18). The nature of the reconciliation which they were charged with announcing (19). The dignity of the ministers of the Gospel (20). A powerful motive for hearkening to the Apostles and becoming reconciled with God (21).

¹ SCIMUS enim, quoniam si
terrestris domus nostra huius
habitationis dissolvatur, quod
aedificationem ex Deo habe-

¹ FOR we know, if our earthly
house of this habitation be dis-
solved, that we have a building
of God, a house not made with

1. The connection with the preceding chapter is very close; indeed there was no need to begin a new chapter here. The Apostle now sets forth explicitly the greatness of the future rewards alluded to in iv. 14–18, pointing first to the glorification of the body which shall take place at the day of judgment in all the just, whether living or dead (vv. 1–5); then to the bliss of the

mus, domum non manufactam, hands, eternal in heaven. ² For aeternam in coelis. ³ Nam et in in this also we groan, desiring

soul, which shall be at home with Christ after death (vv. 6-8). What he says in the present verse is, that they knew by faith that if their mortal body were dissolved in death, they should have an eternal body in heaven (cf. 1 Cor. xv. 42-44, 52). He uses the present "have," because they already firmly possessed it in hope. "Our earthly house of this habitation" should rather be: "our earthly house of *the* tent," i.e., which is a tent (τοῦ σκηνῶν; being a genitive of apposition, defining the nature of the house). The natural body is here called "earthly," because destined for man while on earth, as opposed to the glorified body.—"Quod" of Vulg. is redundant after "quoniam"—In "a building from God, etc.," the reference is not to heaven, but to the glorified body, as is proved by the next verse, where the habitation is said to be *from* heaven, and therefore not heaven itself. "Not made with hands" would indeed apply well to heaven (cf. Heb. ix. 24), but it also aptly describes the glorified body, in the sense that, unlike our present body, it is from God *without human intervention*. The adjective ἀχρηστ. is not found in LXX. nor in classical Greek, and elsewhere in New Testament only in Mark xiv. 58; Col. ii. 11, and the sense we assign to it here appears perfectly admissible. Compare Mark xiv. 49 with John ii. 19-21.

2. In confirmation of the assertion of the preceding verse, namely, that if they died (i.e., did not survive until Christ's Second Coming), they should one day have a glorified body, the Apostle now appeals to the ardent desire he and his companions (or perhaps all the faithful of the time) had to put on the properties of a glorified body without passing through death. The existence of such a desire, since it was implanted by God (v. 5), was evidence that it would be gratified in some (those alive at Christ's Second Coming); and this glorious transformation of those alive at Christ's Second Coming afforded a motive for believing in the glorious resurrection of those dead before then. Καὶ γὰρ ("for indeed") introduces this motive, and the meaning of the verse appears to be: For indeed we groan (with longing) for this reason, namely, that we desire to be clothed upon with our habitation which is from heaven.

"In this" we take to mean "on this account," or "for this reason," for which sense of ἐν τούτῳ cf. 1 Cor. iv. 4; Phil. i. 18;

hoc ingemiscimus, habitationem to be clothed upon with our
nostram quæ de coelo est, habitation that is from heaven :

Acts xxiv. 16, etc. ; and we refer it not to the statement of v. 1, that if they died they should one day have a glorified body, but to what follows in the present verse, as already indicated. Some, as Cornely, refer "in this" to the mortal body, understanding σκήνα, but if the Apostle meant that he ought rather to have written ἐν ταύτῃ to agree with οὐκία; moreover, "this tent" would imply another *tent* beyond the grave, which is opposed to the meaning of the whole passage, where the glorified body is represented as a fixed and permanent dwelling-place of the soul. "To be clothed upon with our habitation that is from (or 'of') heaven." "Clothed upon," i.e., to assume the properties of a glorified body without laying aside our present body, in other words, without dying. The heavenly body is now called τὸ οὐκῆριον, i.e., "a domicile," or permanent dwelling-place, as opposed to the unstable and transitory tent in which the soul lodges on earth ; and it is said to be "from" or "of" heaven, because of its origin and qualities. Compare with the present verse and v. 4, Rom. viii. 22-23 : "For we know that the whole creation groaneth (στενάζει) and travaileth in pain, even till now. And not only it, but ourselves also ; who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body."

3. The text here is uncertain, there being doubt as to whether we ought to read εἰς or εἴη, also whether ἐνδυσσάμενοι ("clothed") or ἐκδυσσάμενοι ("stripped"). The former doubt is not important, as, although εἰς ordinarily means "since indeed," and εἴη ordinarily "if only," yet some philologists contend that they are sometimes interchanged (cf. Corn., note, pp. 146, 147). But the sense of the verse must depend much on whether we read "clothed" or "stripped." For the former we have B K C E K L P, nearly all the cursives, and It., Vulg., Syr., Copt. versions. For the latter D F G, some Latin Fathers, among them Tert., and a MS. known to St. Chrysostom. Clearly the evidence for "clothed" (ἐνδυσσάμενοι) greatly preponderates, and critical editors, such as Brandscheid, W.-H., and Scrivener, do not even allude to the other reading.

Those who, despite the evidence, adopt "stripped" as the true reading, take the verse to mean : "Since even if we are stripped (of our bodies), we shall not be found naked" (void of

superindui cupientes: ³ Si ³ Yet so, that we be found
tamen vestiti, non nudi in- clothed, not naked. ⁴ For we
veniamur. ⁴ Nam et qui sumus also, who are in this tabernacle,

grace), or: "If only when stripped (of the body), we be not found naked" (void of grace). But neither view fits into the context: not the first, because the reason which it seems to offer, is no reason for desiring to be "clothed upon," i.e., to escape death, but rather a reason to the contrary; still less the second, because it supposes those who desire to be "clothed upon" to be at the same time in expectation of death, and implies that they may be "clothed upon," if only they die not void of grace, in other words, that they may escape death, if only they die in the state of grace! And both views give an unnatural sense to γυμνοί ("naked") in a context where there is question of the soul's being clothed with, or stripped of, its corporal raiment.* For these reasons, as well as on account of the improbability of the reading "stripped," we may dismiss these views.

When we take the more probable reading, ἐνδεδυμένοι (clothed), there are very many views as to the sense of the verse, but most of them are quite improbable and need not be mentioned.

The most common view is that the Apostle here explains and qualifies his use of the expression "clothed upon," pointing out that it can apply only to those alive at the last day, as if he said: We desire to be *clothed upon*, provided ("if only" or "if however") we be clad in our bodies (i.e., alive), not stripped of them (i.e., dead) when the time for assuming our glorious bodies is come. This is probably the sense to be attached to the Vulgate and our English version (although both have been explained to mean: if, however, we be clad in *grace* [cf. Apoc. xvi. 15], not naked in regard to it). But this view is not without difficulty. The aorist participle ἐνδεδυμένοι, which would naturally point to a past *action*, is used to describe a condition or state; and even if it be replied (cf. Corn., p. 146) that aorists are sometimes used in this way (Acts iv. 32; 2 Thess. i. 10; Rom. xi. 22), there is special difficulty here, owing to the fact that human souls do not exist prior to their bodies, and the aorist cannot well describe the state of being clothed, if that state was not introduced by an actual clothing, i.e., if the soul had no existence before the

* I know that some have denied that γυμνός can be applied to a disembodied soul, but they are mistaken. Plato, *Crat.* c. 20 has ἡ ψυχὴ γυμνὴ τοῦ σώματος. See also Grimm on γυμνός.

in hoc tabernaculo, ingemiscimus gravati : eo quod nolumus exspoliari, sed supervestiri ; ut absorbeatur quod mortale est,

do groan being burthened : because we would not be unclothed, but clothed upon, that which is mortal may be

body. The aorists above appealed to do not disprove this, for they refer to states which were begun, in the one case by actual belief, in the other by actual fall. Again, this view—"if only we be found clothed, etc."—does not account satisfactorily for the future indicative (ἐνδυσόμεθα).

We take the most probable sense of the verse to be : " Since indeed (εἰς) even clothed (with a new body), not bodiless shall we be found (in heaven, after the general judgment)." This view gives their proper force to εἰς (the more probable reading), to the aorist, to γυνώσκειν in such a context, and to the future indicative. The statement is thrown in parenthetically. The Apostle had said in verse 1 that he and his companions (cf. iv. 15, 16) knew that if they died, a glorious body would be theirs ; in verse 2 he urged in support of this the desire they had to be clothed upon with that glorious body without passing through death, thus implying that whether they were living or dead when the day of judgment came, they would be clothed in glorified bodies. This implication, we believe, is what he now states openly in the present verse, by saying : " since indeed even clothed with a new body, not bodiless, shall we be found." He uses ἐνδυσόμενοι, not ἀπενδυσόμενοι because he wishes to include both those dead before the day of judgment and those alive then ; both classes shall be clothed with a new body, but only the latter shall be " clothed upon " (cf. 1 Thess. iv. 13-16 ; 1 Cor. xv. 51). Grimm (*Lex.* on γέ 3/c) explains the verse in the same sense : " Si quidem etiam (novo corpore) induti nec nudi apparebimus."

4. After the parenthetic assurance in verse 3, the Apostle resumes and develops what he had said in verse 2 ; the general sense is clear from what has been said there. Render : " for indeed we who are in the tent (the body) do groan, being burthened." The groaning was probably on account of a longing to be free ; compare Rom. viii. 23 : " even we ourselves groan within ourselves, *waiting for* the adoption of the sons of God, the redemption of our body " ; the burthen is the anxious fear of death, so that what the Apostle means is that he and his companions longed to be free from their mortal bodies, yet were weighed down by the fear of death, *because* (ἐφ' ᾧ, " because,"

a vita. ³ Qui autem efficit nos in hoc ipsum, Deus, qui dedit nobis pignus spiritus. ⁴ Audentes igitur semper, scientes quoniam dum sumus in corpore, peregrinamur a Domino.

swallowed up by life. ³ Now he that maketh us for this very thing is God, who hath given us the pledge of the Spirit. ⁴ Therefore having always confidence, knowing that, while we are in the body, we are

as in Rom. v. 12) they did not wish to lay aside their bodies in death, but desired to have them clothed at once with the properties of a glorified body.

"That that which is mortal may be swallowed up by life."
 "Neque enim sic supervestiri volumus, ut corpus maneat mortale, sed ita ut gloria auferat ex toto corruptionem corporis absque corporali dissolutione" (St. Thomas). There may be a reminiscence of Is. xxv. 8, quoted in 1 Cor. xv. 54: "Death is swallowed up in victory."

5. Read: "Now He that made us, etc." It is not clear to what "this very thing" refers. Possibly to the possession of a glorified body, whether they died before Christ's Second Coming, as supposed in v. 1, or survived till then in accordance with the desire referred to in vv. 2, 4. But it seems more natural to take "this very thing" as referring to the desire for transformation without the necessity of death, just referred to in vv. 2, 4, and the present verse as showing that this desire shall not be frustrated in all men, since it is God, the Almighty, who has made man such as to have that desire. Hence the desire must be realised in those alive at Christ's Second Coming, they shall be *clothed upon* with glorious bodies; and this transformation of those alive at the last day, thus proved in vv. 2-5, is an argument in favour of the resurrection of those who shall have died before then (v. 1). Instead of "who hath given us the pledge of the Spirit," render rather "who gave us the earnest, etc." The Holy Ghost and His graces conferred upon them at their conversion, giving them a right to an eternal inheritance, were the earnest that God would gratify their desire if they lived till Christ's Second Coming. On ἀρροβῶνα see above on i. 22.

6. "Therefore having always confidence." The sentence begun here and left incomplete in vv. 6-7, is taken up again and completed in verse 8. For "knowing that" read "and knowing that." Knowing that, whether the day of judgment found them living or dead, they should have glorified bodies, they recked

⁷ (Per fidem enim ambulamus, et non per speciem): ⁸ Audemus autem et bonam voluntatem habemus magis peregrinari a corpore, et praesentes esse ad Dominum. ⁹ Et ideo contendimus, sive absentes, sive praesentes, placere illi. ¹⁰ Omnes enim nos manifestari

absent from the Lord. ⁷ (For we walk by faith and not by sight.) ⁸ But we are confident, and have a good will to be absent rather from the body, and to be present with the Lord. ⁹ And therefore we labour whether absent or present, to please Him. ¹⁰ For

not the decay of their natural bodies (iv. 16), nor the light tribulations of the present (iv. 17), but holding on their course, in confidence and courage, and conscious that continued life meant separation from Christ, they desired rather to die and be with the Lord.

7. The substance of the verse is that we have now only mediate knowledge of Christ and God through faith, not immediate, such as is derived from His *visible presence* (εἶδος). Διὰ is to be understood here *of the state in which* (see Grimm on δὲ A. 2) and εἶδος of "visible appearance"; we walk now *in the state* of faith, not in the state when God appears visibly, as He shall in Heaven. "Sight" is not a good rendering of εἶδος—"= nullo graeco scriptore adhuc enotatum est exemplum, quo εἶδος, ut latin. species active dicatur de *adpectu*" (Grimm).

8. Here he resumes the sentence begun in v. 6. Their desire was for the coming of Christ in their lifetime (vv. 2, 4), but, failing that, they desired rather to be absent from the body, i.e., by death, that so they might be *at home* with Christ in Heaven. This desire clearly supposes that the souls of the just that have been purged of all sin are immediately admitted into Heaven, and have not to wait for admission till the day of judgment, a doctrine defined in the Council of Florence (cf. Denz., Enchir. 11th ed., n. 693).

9. "Wherefore also," i.e., seeing that we desire to be with the Lord, "we labour," or "strive eagerly," etc.—"Absent or present"; in the original the order is reversed. The sense seems to be that they strove eagerly to be found pleasing to Him, whether they should be at home in the body (alive) or absent from it (dead), when the day of judgment came. The whole passage tends to show that the Apostle did not know the time of Christ's Second Coming, and thought it possible that it might happen in his own lifetime.

10. For we must all, whether we be found alive or dead (cf.

oportet ante tribunal Christi,
ut referat unusquisque propria
corporis, prout gessit, sive
bonum, sive malum.

¹¹ *Scientes ergo timorem
Domini, hominibus suademus,*

we must all be manifested
before the judgment-seat of
Christ, that every one may
receive the proper things of
the body, according as he hath
done, whether it be good or evil.

¹¹ *Knowing therefore the fear
of the Lord, we use persuasion*

Acts x. 42), be manifested before the judgment-seat of Christ, "who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart" (1 Cor. iv. 5), "in the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ" (Rom. ii. 16). And the object of this manifestation is, that each one may receive, etc. The Apostle has been speaking directly only of himself and his fellow-ministers of the Gospel, but here he evidently includes the Corinthians and indeed all men—at least all adults—"for we must all, etc."—in the liability to judgment. In regard to children who die before they are capable of sinning, Corn., p. 154, says: "*Dicamus igitur cum S. Thom. (Summ. Theol. suppl. qu. 89, a. 5 ad 3), pueros in iudicio comparituros, 'non ut iudicentur, sed ut videant gloriam iudicis' et in eorum quoque sorte quum misericordia tum iustitia Dei patefiat.*"

"The proper things of the body" represents the improbable reading τὰ ἴδια τοῦ σώματος. The true reading is τὰ διὰ τοῦ σώματος. "The things (done) in the body," διὰ referring here, as in v. 7, to state or condition, the things (done) in the state of the body, i.e., during our mortal life. By metonymy, we are said to receive these things, when we receive the rewards or punishments due to them (cf. Col. iii. 25).

"According as he hath done, etc." The natural meaning of this requires that good works merit, by God's goodness, a reward, as evil works merit punishment (see above on iv. 17). The whole verse, according to St. Thomas, states five qualities of the last judgment: 1° its inevitableness ("must"), 2° its universality ("all"), 3° its unerringness ("manifested"), 4° its justice ("according as he hath done"), 5° its authority ("before the tribunal of Christ").

11. "Fear," by metonymy for what causes the fear (cf. Rom. xiii. 3), the fearful judgment of the Lord.

"We use persuasion to men." The idea seems to be that St.

Deo autem manifesti sumus.
Spero autem et in conscientiis
vestris manifestos nos esse.
¹² Non iterum commendamus
nos vobis, sed occasionem da-
mus vobis gloriandi pro nobis,
ut habeatis ad eos qui in facie
gloriantur, et non in corde.
¹³ Sive enim mente excedimus,

to men : but to God we are
manifest. And I trust also that
in your consciences we are
manifest. ¹² We commend not
ourselves again to you, but
give you occasion to glory in
our behalf : that you may have
somewhat to answer them who
glory in face, and not in heart.
¹³ For whether we be trans-

Paul and his companions strove to persuade men of their sincerity, of their constant desire to please God (v. 9), thus to conciliate men and promote the spread of the Gospel ; but such persuasion was unnecessary in regard to God, to whom their hearts were *already* manifest (περὲν ὡμῶντα), even as they must be manifested (φανερῶσθαι, v. 10) before all on the day of judgment ; and they hoped that no such persuasion was necessary in the case of the Corinthians, but that their sincerity was manifest to the consciences of the Corinthians. In the mention of their "consci-ences," there may be an insinuation that the *actions* of the Corinthians sometimes seemed to give reason to doubt this.

12. "We commend not ourselves again" (cf. iii. 1). Lest the preceding statement should be made the ground of a charge against him of pride and boasting, he now states his motive in making it. It is to give them an opportunity of glorying on behalf of himself and his fellow-labourers against their opponents at Corinth.

"Who glory in face and not in heart" (καὶ μὴ ἐν καρδίᾳ). Some take this to mean that these false teachers were *proud* of their external advantages, as their learning, their acquaintance with the Twelve Apostles, etc., to the neglect of the virtues of the heart. But the idea seems rather to be that they pretended to virtues that they did not possess. Cornely explains : "Qui speciem quidem virtutum apostolicarum præ se ferunt, at iis destituti sunt" ; and Grimm on πρόσωπον, c) ; "de iis gloriari, quæ *vultu* prætendunt, pietate, caritate, honestate, quantumvis *animus* ab his virtutibus abhorreat."

13. The connection and thought seem to be : We are not thinking of ourselves, we are not commending ourselves (v. 12), our thought is of God and of you. For whether we be transported in mind (or "beside ourselves," so as to appear *foolish*, xi. 1, 16 ; xii. 11), it is for God's sake and for His greater glory, or whether

Deo : sive sobrii sumus, vobis.
 ■ Charitas enim Christi urget
 nos : aestimantes hoc, quoniam
 si unus pro omnibus mortuus
 est, ergo omnes mortui sunt ;

ported in mind, *it is* to God :
 or whether we be sober, *it is*
 for you. ¹⁴ For the charity of
 Christ presseth us : judging
 this, that if one died for all,

we be sober-minded, it is for your sake. We take it that the reference is to the manner of speaking of himself and his fellow-labourers about themselves and their ministry, as is suggested by the connection with the two preceding verses. If they sometimes appeared to speak extravagantly, extolling themselves and their ministry, it was for God's sake they did so, that the true dignity of their office might be understood ; if at other times they used language of sober-mindedness and moderation (as in i. 8, 9 ; iv. 7 ; 1 Cor. ii. 1-14), it was to set the Corinthians an example of humility, and perhaps to win them to a more sympathetic feeling. Of course whether they spoke extravagantly or moderately, the Apostles had God's glory chiefly in view, so that we need not press too closely the distinction here. The main idea is that all was on account of God or the Corinthians ; nothing merely on their own account.

14. Here he points out what it was that moved himself and his companions to spend themselves for God and the faithful. It was Christ's love for men, because they formed the judgment at their conversion (such seems to be the force of the aorist κρίναντας), 1° that as Christ died for all men, all died vicariously in Him (being redeemed, and so, as far as in Him lay, made dead to their old man of sin), and 2° that He died in order that those who live (the life of grace) may no longer live for themselves but for Him (v. 15)—and hence they especially, the preachers of the Gospel, ought to be dead to sin and self, and live for Christ (and for those for whom He died).

"The love of Christ" is Christ's love for us, manifested in His death, not our love for Him, i.e., τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the subjective genitive, the love residing in Christ as its subject.

"Presseth us." The Greek verb is always used of some strong pressure, as of a crowd (Luke viii. 45), or of anxiety and sickness (Phil. i. 23 ; Luke iv. 38 ; viii. 37 ; Acts xxviii. 8). R.V. : "constraineth us."

"If (εἰ) one died for all." The particle εἰ is wanting in many ancient authorities, but is read in C, and represented in It., Vulg., Copt. and Armen., Versions. It may have been purposely omitted

14 Et pro omnibus mortuus est Christus : ut et qui vivunt, iam non sibi vivant, sed ei qui pro ipsis mortuus est et resurrexit.

then all were dead. 15 And Christ died for all : that they also, who live, may not now live to themselves, but unto Him who died for them and rose

from offence at the hypothetical character of the statement, or accidentally dropped on account of its similarity with εἰς immediately following. If read, it is to be understood as "since"; and if it be not read, the sense will not be affected, for we should then render : "that one died for all (and), so all died."

Who are meant by "all"? It is Catholic teaching that Christ died for all men without exception, and *de fide* that He died for more than the predestined (cf. Perrone, *De Deo Creat.*, n. 451 ff.); and there is nothing to forbid our understanding "all" here in its widest sense, of all men without exception. Christ by His death redeemed all men by paying the price for them (and in so far they all died to sin and its effects), but that each one may appropriate that redemption and apply it to himself, he must be incorporated in the mystical body of Christ, by dying mystically in Baptism, and so participating in Christ's death and its salutary effects (Rom. vi. 2-6; Acts ii. 38). Some think, on account of the context here, that the Apostle is speaking in this verse only of all *Christians*, but the natural sense of the words "one died for all" points to the universal efficacy of Christ's death, and the thought of this serves better to set forth the charity of Christ, and to stimulate the zeal of Paul and his companions. Hence the explanation we have given is preferable.

Our English version of the last words of the verse, "then all were dead," represents what was once the more common view of this passage, namely, that if Christ died for all, then all must have been dead (in original sin), otherwise He need not have died for all. St. Augustine, understanding it in this way, argued from it against the Pelagians that even children must have been infected with original sin. But the Greek, with the two verbs ἀπέθανεν, ἀπέθανον in the same tense, hardly admits this sense, and besides it seems quite foreign to this context that St. Paul should step aside, as it were, to prove the universality of original sin.

15. "Christ" is most probably to be omitted. Some take the verse independently of the preceding as merely a statement of the purpose for which Christ died; others, as we have already indicated, regard this as part of the judgment referred to in

¹⁵ Itaque nos ex hoc neminem novimus secundum carnem. Et si cognovimus secundum carnem Christum : sed nunc iam again. ¹⁶ Wherefore henceforth we know no man according to the flesh. And if we have known Christ according to the flesh : but now we know Him

v. 14—they judged not only that Christ's death meant the death of all (v. 14), but also that all should in future live for Him (v. 15). "They who live," are, according to many, all men who live the natural life, i.e., all men on this earth; others think it more probable that the reference is to those who have appropriated the merits of Christ's death and hence live a new and spiritual life (Rom. vi. 4–5). Whichever view be held, St. Paul and his companions judged that the object of Christ's death was that "they who live" should no longer live for themselves. The fact that they realised that this was Christ's object, was a strong incentive to unselfish zeal.

"And rose again." It is not implied here, any more than in Rom. iv. 25, that Christ *merited* for us by His resurrection. Our redemption was completed by His death, for we were "justified by His blood," and "reconciled to God by the death of His Son" (Rom. v. 9, 10), and He could not merit in His resurrection, because, as St. Thomas says, "in statu resurrectionis non fuit viator sed comprehensor" (cf. John ix. 4; Heb. ix. 12; x. 12). But His resurrection made faith easier, and this facilitated our salvation; and hence, though Christ cannot be said to have risen for our redemption, He may be said to have risen for our salvation and actual justification, or, as here, to have died and risen for us (cf. Rom. iv. 25).

16. Wherefore since Christ expects in us all a new and spiritual life guided by new standards, we, etc.

"Henceforth" (ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν). The natural meaning would be "from the present time," that is, the time this was written; but in the light of what precedes, and especially of what follows, where in the words "even though we have known (ἐγνώκαμεν) according to the flesh Christ," he seems to admit an imperfect knowledge of Christ up to the point of time here indicated, many prefer to understand him to refer to the time when he began to live the new life, when he became a new creature in Christ (v. 17). In this view, it is to the time pointed to in κρινέντος (v. 14) the reference is, for it was then his standards of judgment changed.

"According to the flesh" (κατὰ σάρκα). The position of these

non novimus. ¹⁷ Si qua ergo in Christo nova creatura, vetera transierunt: ecce facta sunt

so no longer. ¹⁷ If then any be in Christ a new creature, the old things are passed away,

words in the original shows, we think, that they are to be connected with the verbs. Knowing according to the flesh, is knowing and judging according to the old natural standards and merely human considerations (cf. xi. 18 with xi. 22 ff.), as opposed to knowing and judging by the standards of the new spiritual life. The Apostle and his companions, since the time of their conversion, no longer judge of men by the old standards; in all they see those for whom Christ died, and in all Christians those who are living in and for Christ.

"And if we have known Christ according to the flesh," or, to remove all ambiguity; "and if (or 'though') we have according to the flesh known Christ." He admits that he at one time knew and judged of Christ by these purely natural standards. This seems to have been before his conversion, when the fact that Jesus had been put to death by the leaders of His race as a criminal, had led Paul and many others, judging by the natural standards of the unregenerate man, to regard Him as an impostor and to persecute His followers. If this had been charged against the Apostle by his opponents at Corinth, we can understand why he thinks it necessary to disclaim such an estimate of Christ now.

Many other views of this verse—most of them very improbable—may be seen in Estius or Cornely. One thing seems certain: the Apostle does not imply that he had ever known Christ personally, while He was on earth. Had he known Christ, we should surely have some clear evidence of the fact somewhere in his writings (1 Cor. ix. 1: "Have I not seen Jesus Our Lord?") is most probably a reference to the appearance on the way to Damascus, Acts ix.). Moreover, he would doubtless, in this case, have been among the persecutors of Jesus, and we should certainly find him expressing his remorse for that, and not merely for opposition to Christ's followers (1 Cor. xv. 9; Acts xxii. 19-20).

17. Render: "So then if anyone is in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold, they are made new." τὰ πάντα "all things" must be omitted in the light of existing evidence. But it is very possible that on account of the sequence τὰ πάντα. τὰ ἅπαντα the words, though genuine, may have been accidentally omitted by some early scribe. If anyone is incorporated with Christ, his old man was buried in Baptism

omnia nova. ¹⁸ Omnia autem ex Deo, qui nos reconciliavit sibi per Christum: et dedit nobis ministerium reconciliationis. ¹⁹ Quoniam quidem Deus erat in Christo mundum re-

behold all things are made new. ¹⁸ But all things *are* of God, who hath reconciled us to Himself by Christ, and hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation. ¹⁹ For God indeed

(Rom. vi. 4), he was *born again* of water and the Holy Ghost (John iii. 5), and endowed with a new principle of a higher life by sanctifying grace, so that he lives a new life (Gal. ii. 20; iii. 27) and is indeed a new creature. For such a one old standards of judgment, old aims in life are passed away, and new ones, enlightened by faith and grace, have succeeded in their stead. The last clause may possibly be an allusion to Is. xliii. 18. Verse 16 points out the change wrought in the ministers of the Gospel; the present verse shows that this wondrous change is not peculiar to them, but shared in by all Christians.

18. He now traces this vast change and renovation to its first cause, God (the Father, "from whom, ἐξ οὗ are all things," 1 Cor. viii. 6). It is not clear whether the first "us" refers to all men, or only, like "us" of the next clause, to the ministers of the Gospel alone. The former view appears more probable, and the use of the word in different senses in two contiguous clauses is sufficiently suggested and explained by the context.

"The ministry of reconciliation." The Apostles and other ministers of the Gospel were appointed to complete the work of Christ, to announce to men and apply to them in the Sacraments the redemption wrought by Him.

19. The Vulg. "quoniam quidem," and our English version "For God indeed," imply that the Apostle develops or proves what he has just said in v. 18, namely, that all things are from God. But this fails to give a natural meaning to ὡς ὅτι. It seems better to take ὡς ὅτι with Estius ("ut quod") and R.V. ("to wit that") as introducing the explanation of the nature of the reconciliation which the ministers of the Gospel were charged with announcing.* The sense would be well brought out by "how that." The reconciliation was the work of God through Christ, God (in view of Christ's merits) forgiving men their sins (if they did their part), and having appointed the ministers of the Gospel to help them to do their part. Such was the scheme of

* For various views of ὡς ὅτι here, see J. H. Moulton, *Proleg.*, p. 212.

concilians sibi, non reputans illis delicta ipsorum, et posuit in nobis verbum reconciliationis. ²⁰ Pro Christo ergo legatione fungimur, tamquam Deo exhortante per nos. Obse-
 cra-

was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not imputing to them their sins, and He hath placed in us the word of reconciliation. ²⁰ For Christ therefore we are ambassadors, God

redemption, which the ministers of the Gospel were charged with announcing and fulfilling.

The most probable sense of the first clause is that "God (the Father) was reconciling the world to Himself by Christ," *ἡ καταλλάσσω* being taken together in the sense of an emphatic imperfect, "was reconciling," as all the Greek Fathers took them. The view of nearly all the Latin Fathers, represented by our version: "for God indeed was in Christ," was that the Divinity of Christ is asserted, and God said to have been in Christ by unity of essence (cf. John xiv. 10, 11). In our view "in Christ" here is equivalent to "by Christ" of the last verse (cf. Matt. ix. 34; Acts xvii. 31, etc.).

"Not imputing to them their sins." The Apostle does not think it necessary to stop to explain here his theory of justification; he deems it enough to point to the result of our reconciliation through Christ, namely, that God does not impute to us our sins. But we know from other parts of his writings that God does not impute them, because they are *wiped out*, and we are *really and internally* justified: "But you are washed, but you are sanctified, but you are justified" (1 Cor. vi. 11); "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the remission of sins" (Col. i. 14); "Yet now He hath reconciled in the body of His flesh through death, to present you holy, and unspotted, and blameless before Him" (Col. i. 22). Surely the author of these texts did not hold a theory of imputative justice.

God did His part to reconcile the entire world, when He gave His only Son to die for the entire world (1 John ii. 2), but each of us must do our part too, if this reconciliation is to take effect and be practical in our case. Hence the Council of Trent, Sess. vi., cap. 3: "Verum etai ille pro omnibus mortuus est, non omnes tamen ejus beneficium recipiunt, sed ii dumtaxat, quibus meritum passionis communicatur."

20. For Christ therefore, as representing Him and carrying on His work, we are ambassadors. The last words of the verse imply that a second conversion, so to speak, was necessary for some

mus pro Christo, reconciliamini Deo. ²¹ Eum, qui non noverat peccatum, pro nobis peccatum fecit, ut nos efficeremur iustitia Dei in ipso.

as it were exhorting by us. For Christ, we beseech you, be reconciled to God. ²¹ Him, that knew no sin, for us He hath made sin, that we might be made the justice of God in Him.

in Corinth. The use of the imperative "be reconciled to God," instead of the infinitive which we might have expected, gives vividness and emphasis.

21. As a powerful motive to move them to be reconciled, the Apostle recalls God's crowning mercy manifested in the death of His Divine Son for sinners (cf. Rom. v. 8-9). Christ was absolutely sinless, He not only committed no sin, but He "knew no sin," whether original or actual (cf. Heb. iv. 15; 1 John iii. 5; 1 Pet. ii. 22, etc.), yet God for our sakes dealt with Him as though He were the greatest sinner—as though He were sin personified—"suffered Him to be condemned as a sinner, and to die as one accursed" (St. Chrysostom), to the end that through His sufferings and merits we might become really just—as it were, justice personified—with the justice that *comes from God* (cf. Rom. iii. 22) and makes us really just in His sight. That there is not question of merely imputed justice, the sinner remaining in his sins and God merely overlooking them, see above on v. 19. If it be objected that since Christ was not really made a sinner, neither are we really made just, we reply that Christ was made a sinner, as far as was possible consistently with His sanctity, *i.e.*, He took our sins upon Him (Is. liii. 6) and suffered for them; and we are made just, as far as is possible consistently with God's mercy and power, and we know from other parts of Scripture (1 Cor. vi. 11; Col. i. 14, 22, etc.) that God's mercy and power extend even to wiping out sin and constituting us really just. Many commentators take the words "He hath made sin" to mean that God made Christ *a victim* for sin, but the antithesis "He hath made sin, that we might be made the justice of God" is altogether against this, and in favour of the view set forth above, that Christ was as far as possible made a sinner, that we might be made just.

CHAPTER VI

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

Co-operating with God, SS. Paul and Timothy exhort the Corinthians not to receive the grace of God in vain, now especially that the time of God's special grace has come (vv. 1-2). While thus co-operating with God, they take care to give offence in nothing, but in everything commend themselves as ministers of God ought (3-4a); by much patience under manifold trials (4b-5), by the exhibition of other virtues (6), by their preaching and accompanying miracles (7a), amid many vicissitudes, and exposed to many false charges (7b-10). This plain speaking to the Corinthians regarding the hardships of the Apostolic life was prompted by love, which was abundant, though ill requited, and which they are now called upon to return by a like affection (11-13). And since love is proved by deeds, he warns them to shun the dangerous society and vices of unbelievers as repugnant to Christian sanctity (14-16), and keeping apart from all pagan uncleanness to preserve themselves as sons of God clean from every defilement (17-vii. 1).

¹ ADIUVANTES autem exhortamur, ne in vacuum gratiam Dei recipiatis. ² Ait enim : Tempore accepto exaudivi te, et in die salutis adiuvi te. Ecce

¹ AND we helping do exhort you, that you receive not the grace of God in vain. ² For He saith : In an accepted time have I heard thee ; and in the day

1. The exhortation begun in v. 20 is continued. "And we helping" (συνεργούμεν), i.e., co-operating (1 Cor. iii. 9) with God (who in v. 20 was said to exhort), we also exhort you that you receive not, etc. They would receive it in vain, if it failed to influence their lives or if they allowed themselves to be involved again in the idolatry and defilements of paganism.

2. The reference is to *Isaias* xlix. 8, where God is represented as addressing His *Servant*, the *Messias*, and through Him His people, and summarising the blessings of the Messianic age. The passage of *Isaias* points to a time of God's special mercy, and the Apostle reminds the Corinthians that it is now come. The words referred to the Messianic age, and St. Paul quotes them in their literal sense.

nunc tempus acceptabile, ecce nunc dies salutis; ³ Nemini dantes ullam offensionem, ut non vituperetur ministerium nostrum: ⁴ Sed in omnibus exhibeamus nosmetipsos sicut Dei ministros, in multa patien-

of salvation have I helped thee. Behold, now is the acceptable time: behold now is the day of salvation. ³ Giving no offence to any man, that our ministry be not blamed: ⁴ But in all things let us exhibit ourselves as the ministers of God, in much patience, in tribula-

3. "Giving no offence to any man." The Greek rather means "giving no offence in *anything*" (ἐν ᾧδενί). The words are to be connected with v. 1, v. 2 being parenthetic, and are spoken of St. Paul and his companions, not of the Corinthians. They co-operated with God (v. 1), giving no offence in anything (v. 3), but in everything commending themselves (v. 4), etc.

"That our ministry be not blamed." Ἡμῶν ("our") is possibly to be omitted; but it gives the sense, for the ministry or ministration is that of the preachers of the Gospel. St. Paul evidently felt, what every priest ought to feel, that the success of his ministry depended much upon the general character of his life.

4. Render: "But in everything exhibiting (rather 'commending,' iii. 1) ourselves." All the Greek MSS. and all the other versions agree against the Vulgate here in reading a participle. Many Latin commentators, misled by the Vulg. "exhibeamus," took the passage 3-10 as an exhortation to the Corinthians how to behave in the time of salvation. But clearly the Apostle continues to speak of the ministers of the Gospel, showing how they co-operated with God, giving no offence, but in everything commending themselves as ministers of God *ought*. The Vulg. in reading "ministros," is again opposed to practically all the other evidence, which supports the nominative δῆκονοι (ministri). What the Apostle says, therefore, is that he and his companions, as ministers of God ought, commended themselves *by* (ἐν of the instrument) much patience in everything: in tribulation, in necessities, etc. Nine classes of things which tried their patience are now mentioned in this and the next verse; the first three are general; of the remaining six, which are particular, three come unsought from without, three are taken up voluntarily by themselves.

"In tribulations, in necessities, in distresses." There seems

tia, in tribulationibus, in necessitatibus, in angustia, ⁵ In plagis, in carceribus, in seditionibus, in laboribus, in vigiliis, in ieiuniis, ⁶ In castitate, in scientia, in longanimitate, in suavitate, in Spiritu

tion, in necessities, in distresses, ⁵ In stripes, in prisons, in seditions, in labours, in watchings, in fastings, ⁶ In chastity, in knowledge, in long-suffering, in sweetness, in the Holy Ghost, in charity unfeigned,

to be a gradation ; the prevailing idea is of pressure or confinement, increasing till in the end, humanly speaking, no way out is left.

5. For instances of "stripes and prisons" in St. Paul's own case, see xi. 23-25 ; Acts xvi. 23.

"Seditions" (or "tumults"), e.g., Acts xix. 23 ff. Some, with St. Chrysostom, take *δοξαστορας* to mean "tossings about," being hunted, as we say, "from post to pillar," so that the ministers of the Gospel could not rest in a place and complete their mission.

In the third triplet he alludes to the "labours" undertaken to spread the Gospel and earn their living (xi. 27 ; Acts xviii. 3) ; to the "watchings" devoted to manual toil or prayer or preaching (e.g., Acts xx. 7) ; and to the "fastings," by which they chastised their bodies, lest when they had preached to others they themselves should become castaways (1 Cor. ix. 27). That Christ meant His followers to fast, see Matt. ix. 15 and parallels ; and that they did fast sometimes in Apostolic days, see Acts xiii. 3 ; xiv. 22 ; so that even if the present verse and xi. 27, were interpreted, as most Protestants interpret them, of hunger induced by want, the New Testament would still supply sanction for the practice of fasting (cf. Matt. iv. 2).

6. From the virtue of patience (and various occasions for its exercise) the Apostle passes on to mention, in this and the next verse, nine other ways by which they commended themselves.

"Chastity" ; possibly the Greek word is to be taken in a wider sense, including indeed chastity, but also purity from every sin, as far as human weakness permits. But see McCarthy, *Epistles of the Sundays*, p. 157 ff.

"Knowledge." Some understand of the wisdom that comes from God, as opposed to mere human wisdom ; others of prudence ; others, as Estius, of the charism referred to in 1 Cor. xii. 8.

"In long-suffering," of those who were hostile ; "in sweetness," i.e., *kindness*, towards all ; "in the Holy Ghost," is taken by

sancto, in charitate non ficta, ' In the word of truth, in the
 ' In verbo veritatis, in virtute power of God ; by the armour
 Dei, per arma iustitiæ a dextris of justice on the right hand and

many as explaining the source of the preceding virtues, as if he said, it is through the grace and help of the Holy Ghost we commend ourselves by these virtues. But it seems more likely that if that were the meaning, the clause would stand at the beginning or the end of the enumeration, explaining the source of all the evidences by which they commended themselves. Hence it is best to understand of some special evidence, taking the clause as co-ordinate with the others, and the reference may be to the Holy Ghost as shining in and influencing their life generally.

7. The first clause refers to the true doctrine they preached sincerely (ii. 17 ; iv. 12) ; the second to the miracles that accompanied it (Mark xv. 20) ; by both they commended themselves.—“By the armour, etc.” Note that the preposition here changes from *ἐν* to *ἐκ*, as in the next two clauses.

Most moderns understand the metaphor to allude to the fact that offensive arms, as the sword or spear, were carried in the right hand and the defensive shield in the left ; so that the meaning would be : we commend ourselves by all kinds of virtues, offensive and defensive—all the virtues being weapons by which righteousness was promoted in others or maintained in themselves. In this view the clause sums up and completes the previous enumeration, and ought to be translated : “By the arms of justice, the right-hand and the left-hand (ones).” This seems a probable view, yet if St. Paul meant it, it is hard to see why he changed the preposition, for *ἐν* might have been used, as in the preceding clauses. The change, together with the fact that *ἐκ* is used in the next two clauses, seems to connect this clause not with what precedes but with what follows, and so the Fathers and earlier commentators connected it. They took the sense to be : We commend ourselves *in* (*ἐκ* of the *state* in which they found themselves) prosperity and adversity, while we use both as instruments (*ἐπὶ*) of righteousness. The clause is then a general statement, particular instances of “prosperous” and “adverse” things being given in what follows. “*Dextera vero et sinistra convenienter intelliguntur prospera et adversa . . . Unde et in extremo iudicio oves a dextris, hœdi autem a sinistris collocandi dicuntur Matth. 25.*” Estius.

et a sinistris ; * Per gloriam, et ignobilitatem ; per infamiam, et bonam famam : ut seductores, et veraces ; sicut qui ignoti, et cogniti : * Quasi morientes, et ecce vivimus ; ut castigati, et non mortificati : ¹⁰ Quasi tristes, semper autem gaudentes : sicut egentes, multos autem locupletantes : tamquam nihil habentes, et omnia possidentes.

¹¹ Os nostrum patet ad vos,

on the left, * By honour and dishonour, by evil report and good report : as deceivers, and yet true : as unknown, and yet known : * As dying, and behold we live : as chastised, and not killed : ¹⁰ As sorrowful, yet always rejoicing : as needy, yet enriching many : as having nothing, and possessing all things.

¹¹ Our mouth is open to you,

8. " Dishonour " refers to *acts* in their presence ; " evil report," to *words* spoken in their absence.—" As deceivers, and yet true." Seven clauses are now introduced by *ὡς* (the rendering of which is needlessly varied in the Vulg. : " ut," " sicut," " quasi," " tanquam ") ; and the sense is that they were spoken of *as being* such and such, while in reality they were far different. The varied rendering of *ὡς* in the Vulg. seems meant to suggest that some of the evil conditions referred to were not merely reputed but actual, which is true in a certain sense ; but the Apostle appears to attend throughout rather to the view his enemies took of those conditions. Our English version correctly gives *καὶ* the sense of " and yet " here, for there is opposition between what they really were and what they were reputed, and hence in the fifth and sixth members *καὶ* is replaced by *ἐν*.

" As unknown " ; they were spoken of by their enemies as if they were obscure and of no account ; yet, *de facto*, they were well known (*ἐνγνωστοὶ*) in the churches.

9. " As chastised," i.e., by God, 1 Cor. xi. 32 ; Heb. xii. 6 ; Apoc. iii. 19. Their enemies ascribed this to the fact that they were great sinners.

10. " As needy," literally " beggars." To the world's estimate that they were beggars and had nothing, the Apostle opposes the reality, namely, that they enriched many and possessed abundantly (*καρτεῶς*) all things. The reference is chiefly to imparting and possessing *spiritual* riches, for the alms which they conveyed to others might meet their wants, but would certainly not be enough to *enrich* them.

11. Estius takes this as an introduction to the severe admonition that follows (vv. 14-18), and understands " our mouth is open

o Corinthii, cor nostrum dilatatum est. ¹² Non angustiamini in nobis : angustiamini autem in visceribus vestris : ¹³ Eandem autem habentes remunerationem, tamquam filiis dico, dilatamini et vos.

O ye Corinthians, our heart is enlarged. ¹² You are not straitened in us : but in your own bowels you are straitened. ¹³ But having the same recompense (I speak as to my children) be you also enlarged.

to you " to mean : I cannot refrain from admonishing you ; the remainder of the verse Estius understands of an enlargement of the heart due to joy, this being referred to by the Apostle, he thinks, in order to lessen the grief of the Corinthians at their own condition as implied in his admonition. But a reference to his own joy seems to us unnatural here, and we prefer with the more common opinion to take the present verse in connection with what has gone before. The Apostle explains why he has spoken so freely in vv. 4-10 of the labours and trials of himself and his companions. His mouth is open to them and he speaks freely, because his heart is enlarged with charity towards them and out of the fullness of the heart the mouth speaketh. The second member of the verse, though having no connecting particle such as " for " or " because," is thus meant to give a reason for the first.

12. He now assures them that there was room enough for them all in his affection (probably he alludes also to the affection of his companions) ; " but," he adds, " in your own bowels you are straitened." In the preceding verse, the heart has been regarded as the seat of the affections ; now it is the bowels. Compare for a similar combination of heart and bowels Aesch., *Agam.* 996, 999. " Σπλάγχνα (bowels) expresses physically the whole interior structure of man, including specially the heart and liver as opposed to what are now technically called the bowels (έντερά). In classical Greek the word is used for the feelings generally " (Stanley). The Apostle means that while he had room for all the Corinthians in his affection, they had not room in theirs for him.

13. Hence he now exhorts them to make a return for his affection by showing a like affection towards him. The Vulgate " habentes," which is not represented in the original, obscures the sense. The Greek may be rendered : " now for a requital in kind (I speak as unto children), be you also enlarged " (in your hearts). Τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμ. is probably an accusative absolute.

¹⁴ Nolite iugum ducere cum infidelibus. Quae enim participatio iustitiae cum iniquitate? Aut quae societas luci ad tene-

¹⁴ Bear not the yoke with unbelievers. For what participation hath justice with in-justice? or what fellowship hath light with darkness?

The resulting sense would be the same if with St. Chrysostom we took τὴν αὐτὴν ἀντιμ. as accusative on λέγω and understood the latter in the sense of commanding or requiring (Mark xiii. 37; John ii. 5), so that the meaning would be: "I now require of you as my children a like requital; be you also enlarged" (in your hearts).

14. This section vi. 14–vii. 1 inclusive, is regarded by some Protestant commentators as not Pauline at all, by others as belonging to some lost epistle of his. They urge that it comes in here quite abruptly and unnaturally, and breaks the continuity of the exhortation in vi. 13; vii. 2. But the section is found here in all the MSS., and while we admit that it is introduced abruptly, we can have no doubt, not only that it is St. Paul's, but that it stands here in its proper place. After the skilful and touching presentment of the trials and hardships of the ministers of the Gospel meant to stimulate the Corinthians, and the moving appeal for their love, vv. 3–13, the Apostle now shows what was in his mind when in verse 1 he exhorted them not to receive the grace of God in vain.

"Bear not the yoke with unbelievers"; literally: "become not unequally-yoked with unbelievers." There is allusion to Deut. xxii. 10, where it is forbidden to yoke an ox and an ass together in the plough; animals thus unequally matched are in fact referred to in the LXX. as ἑτερόζυγοι (Lev. xix. 19). The Apostle means, therefore, that Christians belong, so to speak, to a different class of beings from unbelievers, and hence ought to shun fellowship with them. But what fellowship? In 1 Cor. v. 9–10 he allowed social and commercial intercourse with unbelievers; in 1 Cor. vii. 12 he permitted the Christian party in a mixed marriage to go on living with the unbeliever; and in 1 Cor. x. 27 he permitted Christians to partake of their hospitality. What he forbids in the present passage, therefore, is something different. It is chiefly either, as Estius holds, the *contracting* marriage (which is a different thing from continuing in a marriage already contracted) or it is the avoidance of the vices of the pagans, the yoking with them, so to speak, in their evil ways.

bras ? ¹⁵ Quae autem conventio Christi ad Belial ? Aut quae pars fideli cum infideli ?

¹⁶ Qui autem consensus templo Dei cum idolis ? Vos enim estis templum Dei vivi, sicut dicit Deus : Quoniam inhabitabo in illis, et inambulabo inter eos,

¹⁵ And what concord hath Christ with Belial ? or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever ? ¹⁶ And what agreement hath the temple of God with idols ? For you are the temple of the living God : as God saith : *I will dwell in*

As Cornely, who defends the latter view, points out, vii. 1 suggests that the preceding admonition ought to be taken in a very wide sense. We think it very likely that the Apostle had the contracting of marriage with pagans specially, but not exclusively, before his mind.

"For what participation ? etc." The five questions now put are of course meant to enforce the prohibition. Spiritual "light" and "darkness" are meant, as in Eph. v. 8 : "For you were heretofore darkness, but now light in the Lord" ; the mention of light and darkness, recalling as it does the incompatibility of material light and darkness, serves the Apostle's purpose excellently. In the first two questions, the essential nature of Christianity is compared with that of paganism ; in the next two, the incompatibility of the heads and members in each is pointed out.

15. Instead of "Belial," some authorities read "Belian," others "Beliab," and the majority "Beliar." If the latter is the genuine form here, it is thought to have come into use from a harsh pronunciation of Belial, which was the original form. The word is probably derived from a negative particle בִּלְיָ (b'li) and יָעַל (ya'al, utility), so that its primary sense would be that of uselessness, then vileness and wickedness. Here it is applied by St. Paul to the devil, who is by excellence the useless and wicked one.

16. In this fifth antithesis, the dignity of the Church as a temple of God is appealed to. A temple of the one and only God, from the very nature of the case, ought to have no connection with the images of false gods. But the Corinthians (or all Christians, if with B & D L P ἡμεῖς . . . ἐσμέν be read instead of οὗτοι . . . ἐστέ) were a temple of God, and hence ought to shun all dangerous society or vices of paganism with its accompanying idolatry. St. Paul sometimes speaks of the universal Church as a temple of God (Eph. ii. 21), sometimes of a particular Church (1 Cor. iii. 16), and sometimes of the individual faithful (1 Cor. vi. 19).

et ero illorum Deus, et ipsi erunt mihi populus. ¹⁷ Propter quod exite de medio eorum, et separamini, dicit Dominus, et immundum ne tetigeritis : ¹⁸ Et ego recipiam vos : et ero vobis in patrem, et vos eritis mihi in filios et filias, dicit Dominus omnipotens.

them, and walk among them, and I will be their God and they shall be My people. ¹⁷ Wherefore, *Go out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord, and touch not the unclean thing.* ¹⁸ *And I will receive you ; and I will be a Father to you ; and you shall be My sons and daughters, saith the Lord almighty.*

Probably the reference in the present instance is to the Church, local or universal (according as we read "you" or "we"), rather than to individuals, for he does not say : "you (or we) are temples of God," but : "you (or we) are a temple of God." God is referred to as "living," in contrast with the dead idols.

To prove that they are a temple in which God dwells, Lev. xxvi. 11, 12 (cf. Ezech. xxxvii. 27) is now quoted, the quotation being somewhat free. The words were spoken in reference to the Jewish people and God's dwelling among them in the tabernacle, but St. Paul implies, and supposes his readers to recognise, that they are fulfilled in a higher and more perfect way in God's people, or Church of the new dispensation.

"And they shall be my people" is not to be understood as implying the people's fidelity, but as implying that God will treat them in a special manner as His own people ; for the context shows that there is question of God's special care for them, and not of their response to His graces and benefits.

17. Is. lii. 11 freely after the LXX. The words were an exhortation to the Jews to leave Babylon when the captivity was ended, and, pure from every Gentile pollution, bring back with them to Jerusalem the vessels of the Lord which Nabuchadonozor had carried away from the temple. They may refer in their mystical sense to the avoidance of every pagan pollution by Christians, but it seems more likely that St. Paul only adapts them to his purpose. "Wherefore" (516) is not part of the quotation, but St. Paul's own.

18. No single passage of the Old Testament is here quoted exactly. Some think the substance of Jer. xxxii. 27 and xxxi. 9 is given, where God promises to be God and Father to the Jewish people ; others think the words : "And I will receive you" are from Jer. xxxii. 27 or Ezech. xx. 34 ; and the words that follow :

" And I will be to you a Father, etc.," from 2 Kings vii. 14, where God promises to be a Father to Solomon and to treat him as a chosen son. In favour of the reference to 2 Kings vii. 14 is the fact that in its immediate context, 2 Kings vii. 8, we have in the LXX. the very phrase with which St. Paul's quotation closes ; *ἀγαπᾷ κύριος παντοκράτωρ*. (But in the context of Jeremiah also, the term *παντοκράτωρ* occurs ; Jer. xxx. 35, though not the exact phrase). In any case, whether the words referred literally to Solomon or to the Jewish people, St. Paul signifies that they are true in regard to Christians, God extending to them in a special way His Fatherly care. The insertion of " daughters " (cf. Is. lili. 6) shows how St. Paul realized the extension of the Divine favour to every individual of the Christian society. We may remark that the fact that the term *παντοκράτωρ* could be so easily taken from the context of either passage mentioned above, shows how stupid is the objection founded on the occurrence of this word here against the Pauline authorship of the present passage.

CHAPTER VII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

He exhorts them as heirs to such glorious promises to cleanse themselves from every kind of defilement (v. 1); then resumes the appeal of vi. 13, reminding them of his past conduct towards them, his love for them, his solicitude in their regard, and the comfort he experienced at the comfort of Titus while recounting their good dispositions (2-7). Though his former letter (our First Epistle) made them sorrowful, yet as it made them sorrowful according to God, he now rejoices; for the sorrow that is according to God, unlike the sorrow of the world, causeth repentance unto salvation (8-10). For, behold the change wrought in them by their sorrow (11); so that, as the chief purpose of his letter was attained, he was comforted (12-13a), and in his comfort rejoiced exceedingly at the joy of Titus, because Titus had been refreshed by them all, and St. Paul's praise of them to Titus was proved to be fully justified (13b-14). Titus loves them exceedingly (15), and St. Paul himself in everything has confidence in them (16).

¹ *HAS ergo habentes promissiones, charissimi, mundemus nos ab omni inquinamento carnis et spiritus, perficientes sanctificationem in timore Dei.*

¹ *HAVING therefore these promises, dearly beloved, let us cleanse ourselves from all defilement of the flesh and of the spirit, perfecting sanctification in the fear of God.*

² *Capite nos. Neminem*

² *Receive us. We have*

1. The "promises" that God would receive and treat them as His children (vi. 17, 18), are meant.

"Defilement of flesh and spirit" (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 34) covers all sins, both those which are accompanied by carnal pleasure, like gluttony and impurity, and those without it, like idolatry, pride, disobedience, etc.

"Perfecting sanctification (rather 'holiness,' *ἀγιασμένην*) in the fear of God." A filial fear is meant, "for love begets security, which sometimes causes negligence, but he who fears is always solicitous" (St. Thomas).

2. The appeal of vi. 13 for their love is now resumed. "Receive us"; the most probable sense of *χωρήσατε* is: "make room for us"

laesimus, neminem corrupimus, neminem circumvenimus. ² Non ad condemnationem vestram dico. Praediximus enim quod in cordibus nostris estis, ad commoriendum et ad convivendum. ⁴ Multa mihi fiducia est apud vos, multa mihi gloriatio pro vobis, repletus sum consolatione, superabundo gaudio in omni tribulatione nostra. ⁵ Nam et cum venissemus in Macedoniam, nullam requiem habuit caro

injured no man, we have corrupted no man, we have overreached no man. ² I speak not this to your condemnation. For we have said before, that you are in our hearts, to die together, and to live together. ⁴ Great is my confidence with you, great is my glorying for you. I am filled with comfort : I exceedingly abound with joy in all our tribulation. ⁵ For also when we were come into Macedonia, our flesh had no

(in your hearts). The clauses that follow, support and justify this appeal : we wronged no man (among you), we corrupted no man by false doctrine (cf. xi. 3), we extorted money from no man (cf. xii. 16-18). Doubtless such charges had been made against him, and he may be hinting at the practice of the false apostles.

3. "I speak not this to your condemnation." Neither "this" nor "your" is represented in the Greek, but they complete the sense, for clearly the reference is to what has just been said in verse 2, while the next clause : "*for* I have said before, etc.," seems to indicate that it is condemnation of the Corinthians he is here disclaiming.

"For we have said before." The evidence is conclusive in favour of the singular number here : "*I* have said before." What is said here of his intense love for them, he had substantially said already in iii. 2 and vi. 11, 12.

4. "Great is my confidence with you" ; rather : "great is my freedom of speech towards you." For this meaning of *παρρησία* see above on iii. 12.—"In all our tribulation" (*ἐν πάσῃ τῇ θλίψει ἡμῶν*) not, in every tribulation of ours, but "in the whole of our tribulation," i.e., amid it all.

5. This arrival in Macedonia is that referred to in Acts xx. 1. From ii. 12-13 we know that he crossed to Europe from Troas on the N.W. coast of Asia Minor ; from the same passage we learn that he had no rest in his *spirit* at Troas, because Titus was not there (to give him news of the Corinthians). The present words : "our *flesh* had no rest," show that to this anxiety of mind there was added in Macedonia external affliction, so that on all sides or in every way (*ἐν παντί*) he was afflicted, combata

nostra, sed omnem tribulationem passi sumus : foris pugnae, intus timores. ⁶ Sed qui consolatur humiles, consolatus est nos Deus in adventu Titi. ⁷ Non solum autem in adventu eius, sed etiam in consolatione, qua consolatus est in vobis, referens nobis vestrum desiderium, vestrum fletum, vestram aemulationem pro me, ita ut magis gauderem.

⁸ Quoniam etsi contristavi

rest, but we suffered all tribulation : combats without, fears within. ⁶ But God, who comforteth the humble, comforted us by the coming of Titus. ⁷ And not by his coming only, but also by the consolation, wherewith he was comforted in you, relating to us your desire, your mourning, your zeal for me, so that I rejoiced the more.

⁸ For although I made you

without with the enemies of the Gospel, fears within himself for the welfare of the Corinthian Church.

6. "Humble" (ταπεινός), *i.e.*, those cast down by suffering, sorrow, want, etc., but who trust not in themselves but in God (cf. 1 Pet. v. 5).

7. Not only the coming of Titus, but also the feelings he manifested (which he had of course experienced when in Corinth and which now waxed strong again, as he told his story) *while he related* the condition of the Corinthian Church, gave St. Paul and his companions comfort.

Their "desire" doubtless was to see the Apostle present among them ; their "mourning" was on account of his grief and indignation and the state of their Church which caused it ; their "zeal" in his behalf (ὁμιᾷ ἐμοῦ) was an eager desire on their part to stand up for him and defend him against his enemies.

"So that I rejoiced the more," *i.e.*, the comfort or consolation which Titus felt and manifested in recounting the condition of the Corinthian Church, made St. Paul rejoice more than the coming of Titus had done (cf. v. 13). Some understand : more than he had previously grieved.

8. "By my epistle" (ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ). The reference is to our present First Epistle to the Corinthians, though this is denied by some modern Protestant writers. See above on ii. 3, and Intro. ii. 1. (*b*).

There is a good deal of confusion about the punctuation, and connection of the clauses, of this verse, and there is additional uncertainty owing to the fact that it is doubtful whether we ought to read βλέπω γὰρ ὅτι with most Greek MSS., or βλέπω ὅτι, omitting γὰρ, with B D and A^{ms}, or βλέπων ὅτι, which the Vulg.

vos in epistola, non me poenitet : sorrowful by my epistle, I do
 etsi poeniteret, videns quod not repent : and if I did repent,
 epistola illa (etsi ad horam) vos seeing that the same epistle

seems to have read, and which Lachm., W.H. and others conjecture to have been the primitive reading.

The Revised Version, agreeing with St. Chrysostom and the *Textus Receptus* as to the connection of the clauses renders thus : " For though I made you sorry with my epistle, I do not regret it, though I did regret ; for I see that that epistle made you sorry, though but for a season. Now I rejoice, etc." But it is against this that the clause " for I see that that epistle, etc.," thus seems to give a reason for the main statement of the preceding clause, namely, that St. Paul at the time of writing did not regret the sorrow he had caused. But in its present form, it gives no such reason. To give such reason, it ought to have run : For I see that that epistle gave you only *short-lived* sorrow, or something to that effect, the passing character of the sorrow being thrown into prominence as the chief part of the statement.

Hence we prefer, with Lachm., Tisch., W.H., Corn., etc., the connection in our current English version which renders as follows : " For although I made you sorrowful by my epistle, I do not repent ; and if I did repent (*i.e.*, before he learned from Titus the happy fruits of their sorrow in their repentance and amendment) seeing that the same epistle (although but for a time) did make you sorrowful ; now I am glad, etc." This makes good sense, for the clause " seeing that the same epistle, etc.," gives a good reason why he did repent for a time ; he repented because of their sorrow (short though it was), but now that he has learned from Titus that it was a sorrow unto repentance, he rejoices. It must be admitted, however, that this view supposes the reading βλέπων ὅτι to be correct, for it supposes that he regretted their sorrow *at the time when he saw* (βλέπων) that the letter had caused sorrow. On the other hand, if βλέπω with or without γὰρ had to be read, it would refer to the time of his writing.

" Poeniteret " of the Vulg. ought to be " poenitebat," and if the above view is correct, " videns " ought to be " videntem " (" et si me poenitebat videntem quod . . . nunc gaudeo ").

Whatever be the true reading, and connection of the clauses, the general sense is clear, namely, that though the Apostle

contristavit : * Nunc gaudeo : non quia contristati estis, sed quia contristati estis ad poenitentiam. Contristati enim estis secundum Deum, ut in nullo detrimentum patiamini ex nobis. ¹⁰ Quae enim secundum Deum tristitia est, poenitentiam in salutem stabilem operatur : saeculi autem tris-

(although but for a time) did make you sorrowful : * now I am glad : not because you were made sorrowful ; but because you were made sorrowful unto penance. For you were made sorrowful according to God, that you might suffer damage by us in nothing. ¹⁰ For the sorrow that is according to God worketh penance steadfast unto sal-

formerly regretted their sorrow, he does so no longer, seeing that it had led them to repentance.

9. "That you might suffer damage by us in nothing," i.e., not even when we saddened you, but rather, as is implied, spiritual profit.

10. He has just said that the Corinthians had been made "sorrowful according to God" and implied that this was for their good ; he now explains this by pointing out the effect of sorrow according to God. A sorrow that pleases God, that is *according to His will* is meant, and such sorrow must come from God's grace, and spring from a love of God, at least incipient. This sorrow "worketh penance, steadfast unto salvation." The Vulg. "stabilem," represented by "steadfast" in our version, seems to point to a reading ἀμετέβλητον (immutable), but the true reading is ἀμεταμέλητον (that bringeth no regret or is not repented of), and this adjective may be connected either with "salvation" or with "penance"—penance unto a salvation that is not repented of, or penance that is unto salvation and that is not repented of. The latter seems more probable, since μετάνοια (penance) is used here in its primary sense of "change of mind," and the Apostle might naturally speak of a change of mind that is not repented of. Μετάνοια is often used in a wide sense so as to include sorrow for the past accompanied by penitential acts, together with a change of mind (Matt. iii. 8, 11 ; Luke iii. 8 ; xv. 7, etc. ; cf. Matt. xi. 21), but since it is here distinguished from the sorrow that is according to God as effect from cause, it can mean only penitential works, as is perhaps meant by our version "penance," or more probably a change of mind. Sorrow for the past brings a change of mind for the future.—"But the

titia mortem operatur. ¹¹ Ecce enim hoc ipsum, secundum Deum contristari vos, quantum in vobis operatur sollicitudinem : sed defensionem, sed indignationem, sed timorem, sed desiderium, sed aemulationem, sed vindictam ; in omnibus exhibuistis vos, incontaminatos esse negotio.

¹² Igitor, etsi scripsi vobis, non propter eum qui fecit iniuriam, nec propter eum qui passus est ; sed ad manifestan-

vation : but the sorrow of the world worketh death. ¹¹ For behold this self-same thing, that you were made sorrowful according to God, how great carefulness it worketh in you : yea defence, yea indignation, yea fear, yea desire, yea zeal, yea revenge : in all things you have shewed yourselves to be undefiled in the matter.

¹² Wherefore although I wrote to you, *it was* not for his sake that did the wrong,

sorrow of the world worketh death." Sorrow that springs only from worldly motives, as the loss of worldly goods or friends, and is not tempered by religion, hardens and distracts the heart and draws it away from God, and so leads to *eternal* death, which must be meant here, opposed as it is to salvation.

11. For "worketh" read "wrought" (καταργάσας). Moved by the Apostle's letter, which had saddened them according to God, they had shown (as he had learned from Titus) "carefulness," *i.e.*, serious earnestness in the matter of the incestuous Corinthian, about which they had seemed indifferent before he wrote the present First Epistle to them (1 Cor. v. 2) ; nay, they had defended themselves, by showing that they had tried to do their part to correct the sinner ; nay, they had manifested their indignation that their Church should be disgraced by such a crime ; nay, they had shown their fear of the Apostle ; nay, their longing to see him ; nay, their zeal against the offender or for St. Paul ; nay, they had punished the sinner by expelling him from their Church ; in every way (ἐν παντί), they had shown themselves (as Titus testified) to be now pure or undefiled in the affair (ἐν τῷ πράγματι) of the incestuous sinner.

12. Of course the Apostle had intended the punishment of the sinner, for he had ordered the Corinthians to excommunicate him (1 Cor. v. 13) ; he had intended also this satisfaction to the sinner's father who had suffered the wrong, so that all he can mean here is that it was *not so much* (cf. ii. 5 ; 1 Cor. i. 17 ; xv. 10) these ends he had in view as another. What precisely the other end was, whether to prove his own zeal for the Corinthians, or to give them an opportunity of proving theirs for him,

dam sollicitudinem nostram, quam habemus pro vobis. ¹² Coram Deo : ideo consolati sumus. In consolatione autem nostra, abundantius magis gavisi sumus super gaudio Titi, quia refectus est spiritus eius ab omnibus vobis. ¹³ Et si quid apud illum de vobis gloriatus sum, non sum confusus : sed sicut omnia vobis in veritate locuti sumus, ita et gloriatio nostra, quae fuit ad Titum, veritas facta est. ¹⁵ Et viscera eius abundantius in vobis sunt : reminiscens omnium vestrum obedientiam, quomodo cum timore et tre-

not for him that suffered it : but to manifest our carefulness that we have for you, ¹² Before God : therefore we were comforted. But in our consolation we did the more abundantly rejoice for the joy of Titus, because his spirit was refreshed by you all. ¹⁴ And if I have boasted anything to him of you, I have not been put to shame, but as we have spoken all things to you in truth, so also our boasting that was made to Titus, is found truth. ¹⁵ And his bowels are more abundantly towards you ; remembering the obedience of you all, how with

is uncertain, as it is doubtful whether we ought to read with the Vulg. and Vet. It. : "to manifest our carefulness that we have for you in the sight of God," or with the Revised Version and many other authorities : "that your carefulness for us might be made manifest unto you in the sight of God." Either reading might be supported from other passages ; the former, for instance, from ii. 4 ; the latter from ii. 9.

13. In any case, his purpose, whichever it was, was attained, and therefore he was comforted when he learned the result from Titus. And in his comfort he rejoiced the more exceedingly because of the joy of Titus at the dispositions shown by the Corinthians, "for his spirit was refreshed (rather, 'hath been refreshed,' i.e., was and is refreshed) by you all."

14. Instead of : "And if I have boasted," read : "*For* if, etc."

15. For "in vobis" of Vulg. read "*erga vos*." "Remembering," i.e., while he recalls. As he is about to send Titus back to Corinth to look after the collection for the poor of Jerusalem (viii. 6), he wishes Titus to stand well with the Corinthians, and to this end dwells here on his affection for them.

"Fear and trembling," i.e., trembling anxiety to obey Titus and do what he desired of them. On this phrase see above on 1 Cor. ii. 3. As Titus was St. Paul's legate, this obedience to him was obedience to the Apostle himself.

16. In these flattering words he closes the apologetic portion

more excepistis illum. ¹⁸ Gaudeo fear and trembling you received
quod in omnibus confido in him. ¹⁸ I rejoice that in all
vobis. things I have confidence in you.

of the Epistle, and dexterously prepares the way for the appeal to their charity contained in the next two chapters. The sense is not "I am bold through your encouragement" (Stanley), but as our version puts it : "in all things I have confidence in you," or as the R.V. equivalently : "in everything I am of good courage concerning you."

CHAPTER VIII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

The example of the churches of Macedonia in making the collection for the poor of Jerusalem (vv. 1-5), moved SS. Paul and Timothy to send Titus to finish the collection in Achaia (6). Exhortation to the Christians of the latter to do their part (7). St. Paul does not command them to make the collection, but stimulates them by putting before them the zeal of others in the matter, and reminding them how Christ became poor that they might be made rich (8-9). It was fitting that they who had been among the first to begin the collection should now bring it to completion according to their means (11-12), and it was only according to their means they were expected to give, for they were not asked to rob themselves in order to enrich others (12-15). Titus and two others who are to accompany him are commended, and the churches of Achaia are exhorted to give proof of their charity, and of the justice of St. Paul's boasting in their regard (16-24).

¹ NOTAM autem facimus ¹ Now we make known unto
vobis, fratres, gratiam Dei, you, brethren, the grace of God,
quae data est in ecclesiis that hath been given in the

The collection in aid of the Christian poor of Jerusalem referred to in this chapter and the next, had been begun in Achaia and in Corinth its capital some time before the present letter was written (viii. 10 ; ix. 2). In 1 Cor. xvi. 1, 2, St. Paul evidently replies to some inquiry regarding it : " Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given orders to the churches of Galatia, so do ye also. On the first day of the week let every one of you put apart with himself, laying up what it shall well please him (rather, ' what he can afford '), that when I come, collections be not then to be made." And in the Epistle to the Romans, written a few months after the present Epistle, he says : " For it hath pleased them of Macedonia and Achaia to make a contribution for the poor of the saints that are in Jerusalem." And we know from St. Luke that the proceeds of this collection were brought to Jerusalem by St. Paul a short time after (Acts xxiv. 17), these

Macedoniae, ² quod in multo experimento tribulationis, abundantia gaudii ipsorum fuit : et altissima paupertas eorum abundavit in divitias simplici-

churches of Macedonia, ² that in much experience of tribulation they have had abundance of joy, and their very deep poverty hath abounded unto the riches of their simplicity.

various passages thus undesignedly confirming each other's truth. See on 1 Cor. xvi. 1.

1. The passing to a new subject is marked by the *δέ* as in 1 Cor. vii. 1 ; viii. 1 ; xii. 1 ; xv. 1.

"The grace of God that hath been given in the churches of Macedonia." Both Estius and Cornely understand of the grace of God given to these churches, and producing the result mentioned in the verses that follow : "*Reddimus vos certiores de beneficio divinitus collato in ecclesias Macedoniae*" (Est.) ; "*Generali enim modo beneficium divinitus collatum significatur*" (Corn.). But the form of expression : "*given in (δεδομένην ἐν) the churches*" agrees ill with this, and seems rather to indicate that "*the grace (τὴν χάριν) of God*" is put by metonymy for the manifestation of the grace of God, *i.e.*, for the liberality shown in these churches by their contributions.

2. "Experience of tribulation," *i.e.*, testing by tribulation. For the tribulations of the Macedonian Christians, see Acts xvii. 5, 13 ; 1 Thess. i. 6 ; ii. 14 ; 2 Thess. i. 4 ; Phil. i. 29.

The Vulgate by inserting "*fuit*," which is not represented in the Greek, has turned what was originally one statement into two. Render : "That in much experience of tribulation, the abundance of their joy, and their very deep poverty, (have) abounded unto the riches of their simplicity," *i.e.*, though tried by many tribulations, the abundance of spiritual joy with which they were filled and the very deep (κατὰ βάθος "reaching deep down") poverty by which they were pressed, abounded unto a most generous contribution given with simplicity of heart, their intention being only to help the poor and honour God. "Nam qui aliud opere ostendit, aliud animo cogitat, cor duplicat, uti loquitur Augustinus" (Est.). Such is the sense more commonly attached to the last words of the verse, but it may be that ἀπλότης (primarily "simplicity," "candour") means here "liberality," as apparently in ix. 11, 13 (cf. Grimm), so that the sense would be : abounded unto the riches of their liberality, *i.e.*, very great liberality.

tatis eorum : ³ Quia secundum virtutem testimonium illis reddo, et supra virtutem voluntarii fuerunt, ⁴ Cum multa exhortatione obsecrantes nos gratiam, et communicationem ministerii, quod fit in sanctos. ⁵ Et non sicut speravimus, sed semetipsos dederunt primum Domino, deinde nobis per voluntatem Dei : ⁶ Ita ut rogaremus Titum, ut quemad-

³ For according to their power, (I bear them witness), and beyond their power, they were willing ; ⁴ With much entreaty begging of us the grace and communication of the ministry that is done toward the saints. ⁵ And not as we hoped, but they gave their own selves first to the Lord, then to us by the will of God : ⁶ Insomuch, that we desired Titus, that as he had

3-5. These three verses have but one principal verb, and form one sentence in the original. The sense is as follows : For according to their means (I bear witness) and beyond their means, of their own accord, beseeching us with much entreaty for the favour of a share in this ministration to the saints, and not as we expected, but they gave their own selves first to the Lord and then to us by the will of God. *τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας* (v. 4), which our version renders : " the grace and communication of the ministry," is most probably to be understood as indicated, *τὴν χάριν καὶ τὴν κοινωνίαν* being put by hendiadys for *τὴν χάριν τῆς κοινωνίας*. *τὴν χάριν* is accus. after *δεόμενοι* which as the participle of a verb of entreating governs two accusatives, one of the person, the other of the thing.

" And not as we hoped " (or " expected "). This is taken by some to mean that the sum contributed surpassed his expectations, but as that has already been sufficiently implied in " beyond their power " (v. 4), the present clause rather means that their alacrity and zeal for the good work surprised him. He had expected indeed that they would respond to his appeal, but it was not merely as he expected, but they gave themselves (as we might say now) heart and soul first to the Lord, and then to Paul and Timothy, for this work. " First to the Lord " does not indicate a priority of time, but of importance. " By the will of God " shows that their complete surrender of themselves was the work of God inspiring and strengthening them by His grace. " Wonder not, O man ; they had God for helper ; but where God helps, nothing is impossible " (Phot.).

6. Encouraged by the zealous example of the Macedonians, Paul and Timothy exhorted Titus to go and complete the collection in Achaia.

modum coepit, ita et perficiat in vobis etiam gratiam istam.

⁷ Sed sicut in omnibus abundatis fide, et sermone, et scientia, et omni sollicitudine, insuper et charitate vestra in nos, ut et in hac gratia abun-

begun, so also he would finish among you this same grace :

⁷ That as in all things you abound in faith, and word, and knowledge, and all carefulness ; moreover also in your charity towards us, so in this grace also

" As he had begun," or reading as we probably must, not ἐνῆρξετο but προενήρξετο : " as he had begun *before*." The natural view is that Titus had interested himself in this collection on the occasion of his previous visit, xii. 18 ; 1 Cor. xvi. 12, and now he was exhorted that as he had made a beginning before, he would now *also* bring to completion this grace *also* (as well as other matters that he had brought to a satisfactory conclusion on the occasion of his first visit, or was now expected to bring).

What precisely is meant by " this same grace " or rather " this grace also," is not very clear. We think it most likely that it refers to their liberality, which was a result of God's grace, and which Titus was to " finish " or bring to completion or perfection by getting the collection satisfactorily wound up.

7. He begins his exhortation by praising them. Ἀλλὰ (" but ") has here a hortative force as in Mark ix. 22 : " Now then."—" Faith " is doubtless the theological virtue whereby we believe God's revelation ; " word and knowledge " are probably to be understood, as in 1 Cor. i. 5, of the knowledge and right understanding of revealed doctrine ; " carefulness " (σπουδῇ), of their zeal generally in doing their duty as Christians. Though the reading in the next clause : " moreover also in your charity towards us " is doubtful, B Copt., Arm., some Syr., and a few cursives reading ἐξ ἡμῶν ἐν ὑμῖν the other authorities ἐξ ὑμῶν ἐν ἡμῖν there can be no doubt that our version gives the true sense and that there is question in this context of the charity of which the Corinthians were the subjects, not the objects, i.e., of their charity for SS. Paul and Timothy, not of that of the latter for them. There may be question as to which of the two Greek readings gives this sense. That of B, etc., will give it, if we understand of " the charity awakened by us in you," but the second reading does not well yield it, unless ἐν ἡμῖν be rather arbitrarily taken as equal to εἰς ἡμᾶς, in which case of course the sense would be " your charity towards us."

" So in this grace also you may abound " (ἵνα καὶ κ.τ.λ.). The

detis. ⁸ Non quasi imperans dico : sed per aliorum sollicitudinem, etiam vestrae charitatis ingenium bonum comprobans. ⁹ Scitis enim gratiam Domini nostri Iesu Christi, quoniam propter vos egenus factus est, cum esset dives, ut illius inopia vos divites essetis. ¹⁰ Et consilium in hoc do : hoc

you may abound. ⁸ I speak not as commanding : but by the carefulness of others, approving also the good disposition of your charity. ⁹ For you know the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, that being rich he became poor, for your sakes ; that through His poverty you might be rich. ¹⁰ And herein

live with a Subjunctive is equivalent to an Imperative (cf. 1 Cor. vii. 29 ; Eph. v. 33 ; Gal. ii. 10 ; Mark v. 23, and see Beel., G. G., p. 346), and so the sense of the whole verse is : Now then as you abound in all the other graces, see that you abound in this grace also. " This grace also " implies that that in which he is exhorting them to abound is a grace like " faith," " knowledge," etc., and hence " grace " in this verse cannot mean " collection," but is probably to be taken, as in vv. 1, 6 of their liberality in giving.

8. " But by the carefulness, etc." Rather : " but through the zeal of others testing (*δοκιμάζων*) the genuineness (*τὸ γνήσιον*) also of your charity." The " ingenium bonum " of the Vulg. gives substantially the same sense : " good disposition," or sincerity of your charity. Estius and others have conjectured that the original Vulg. reading was " ingenuum," which would be the exact equivalent of *γνήσιον* ; but the earliest existing MSS. of the Vulg. and the earliest quotations in the Fathers are against this, and besides " bonum " of the Vulg. would then have been unnecessary.

9. Command from him that they should help their poor brethren in Jerusalem was unnecessary if they recalled what they knew, namely, how Jesus Christ, though He was rich (with the infinite riches of God), came out from the bosom of His Father (John xvi. 28 ; xvii. 5), and became poor for their sakes (Matt. viii. 20 ; cf. Phil. ii. 7), that through His poverty they might be made spiritually rich. Instead of " for your sakes, that you might be made rich, some authorities read : " for our sakes, that we, etc.," but the great weight of authority supports the former reading, which is also more direct and impressive.

It is hardly necessary to note how convincing is the proof supplied by this verse for the pre-existence and Divinity of Christ.

10. " Advice " or " counsel " as opposed to precept (v. 8).—

enim vobis utile est, qui non solum facere, sed et velle coepistis ab anno priore: ¹¹ Nunc vero et facto perficite: ut quemadmodum promptus est animus voluntatis, ita sit et perficiendi ex eo quod habetis.

¹² Si enim voluntas prompta

I give my advice: for this is profitable for you, who have begun not only to do, but also to be willing, a year ago: ¹¹ Now therefore perform ye it also in deed; that, as your mind is forward to be willing, so it may be also to perform, out of that which you have. ¹² For if the will be forward, it

"For this is profitable, etc." "This" refers back to the liberality, to which he exhorted them in verse 8, and he tells them that such liberality becomes (*συμπίπτει*) them, as being people (*όντες*, "quippe qui") who began before others, at least before the Macedonians (*προενήργησθε*) not only to do, but also to be willing, a year ago.

"Not only to do, etc.," i.e., "not only to do something *ποιῆσαι* (aorist of instantaneous act), but also to stand in readiness (*ἔλκειν*, present) for doing more. This readiness had been checked by the dissensions which had broken out at Corinth, and no further step had been taken in the way of a collection, until perhaps quite recently" (Rickaby).

"A year ago." We infer from 1 Cor. xvi. 1 that they had been thinking of this collection before that Epistle was written. The First Epistle was written about Easter, and our Second Epistle in or about September of the same year. The Apostle signifies that about a year had elapsed since they first took the matter up or, less definitely, that they were willing from the year before.*

11. Literally: "that as there is the readiness to be willing, so also (there may be) the completion, out of what you have" (can afford). He does not ask them to give beyond their means, as the Macedonians had done, much less, to sell all they had and give to the poor, as Christ told the young man to do, if he would be perfect (Matt. xix. 21). Nothing so heroic was asked of them.

12. This explains "out of what you have," of the preceding verse. If a man have the proper dispositions, his alms, however small they may be, are acceptable to God, if they are in proportion

* For the meaning here, it probably does not matter what calendar the Apostle followed. The ecclesiastical calendar of the Jews began with the first of Nisan, or the Spring equinox; their civil calendar, like the Macedonian, with the Autumnal equinox. The Athenian calendar, which corresponds to the Olympian reckoning, began the year with the Summer solstice, while the political calendar of the Romans began with the first of January. See Zahn, *Introd.* i., p. 319; Corn., *in loc.*, p. 225.

est; secundum id quod habet, accepta est, non secundum id quod non habet. ¹³ Non enim ut aliis sit remissio, vobis autem tribulatio, sed ex aequalitate. ¹⁴ In praesenti tempore vestra abundantia illorum inopiam suppleat: ut et illorum abundantia vestrae inopiae sit supplementum, ut fiat aequali-

is accepted according to that which a man hath, not according to that which he hath not. ¹³ For I mean not that others should be eased, and you burthened; but by an equality. ¹⁴ In this present time let your abundance supply their want: that their abundance also may supply your want, that there

to his means (cf. Mark xii. 43-44). The subject throughout is ἡ προθυμία personified: "according to that which it hath, etc.," but our version supplying "a man": "that which a man hath" gives the same sense.

13. The "others" are not the Macedonians, whom the Corinthians might suspect him of wishing to spare, for they had already given beyond their means (v. 3), but the Christians of Jerusalem. He does not suggest the collection, that the "others" may be relieved from distress at the expense of the distress of the Christians of Achaia, but that there may be some sort of equality (ὅλλ' ἕξ ἰσότητος), all having at least enough.

14. The thought of a certain equality in material things leads on to the thought of a certain equality in spiritual things effected through it. It is as if he said: Help them now in material things that they may help you now in spiritual things by their prayers, and so there may be a certain equality both in material and in spiritual things. If this be the sense, as seems more probable, the words "in this present time" suggest something that has not been expressed, as "and in the life or time to come all of you shall have your reward."

Most Protestant and some Catholic commentators understand both clauses of material things, as if the Apostle meant: Help them now, that on some future occasion when you may be in need, they may help you. But this is certainly not in the manner of St. Paul (cf. Rom. xv. 27, where he is speaking of this same collection), nor according to the mind of Christ (Luke xiv. 12), and indeed the hope of some temporal return from those benefited would be a poor motive for an inspired Apostle to propose to alms-givers.

15. The quotation is from Exod. xvi. 18, where there is reference to the gathering of the manna in the desert. It represents the Hebrew exactly, and agrees with the LXX. almost exactly. The

tas, sicut scriptum est : ¹⁵ Qui multum, non abundavit : et qui modicum, non minoravit.

¹⁶ Gratias autem Deo, qui dedit eandem sollicitudinem pro vobis in corde Titi, ¹⁷ Quoniam exhortationem quidem suscepit : sed cum sollicitior esset, sua voluntate profectus est ad vos. ¹⁸ Misimus etiam cum illo fratrem,

may be an equality. ¹⁵ As it is written : *He that had much, had nothing over ; and he that had little, had no want.*

¹⁶ And thanks be to God, who hath given the same carefulness for you in the heart of Titus.

¹⁷ For indeed he accepted the exhortation : but being more careful, of his own will he went unto you. ¹⁸ We have sent also with him the brother,

Apostle quotes just enough to remind his readers of God's miraculous intervention to establish equality in regard to the quantity of manna each one was allowed to have. We read in Exodus : "And they gathered, one more, another less. And they measured by the measure of a gomor : neither had he more that had gathered more : nor did he find less that had provided less." St. Paul recalls this marvellous intervention of God, to suggest that the equality to which he is exhorting is pleasing to God, and hence ought to be sought after by his readers. The text is not applied here in its literal or mystical sense. At most there is accommodation, or rather mere allusion to what took place in the desert, the sense being : that there may be equality (v. 14), as there was of old by Divine intervention, in the circumstances to which this text of Exodus refers.

16. He now turns to speak of the collectors, whom he is sending to Achaia.

"The same carefulness for you," i.e., the same zealous interest in you, the same earnestness in your regard, as I have myself.

17. "Being more careful." A comparison is hardly intended ; the R.V. renders : "being himself very earnest." If a comparison be meant, it is : being more earnest than to need exhortation.

"He went" (ἔξῆλθεν), an epistolary aorist (cf. *vs.* 18, 22), in which the Apostle speaks relatively to the time when this present epistle will be received in Corinth, for according to the common opinion it was Titus who carried it thither.

18. Who "the brother" here referred to was, cannot be determined. That he was not one of St. Paul's ordinary companions, seems probable from verse 23, where Titus (as a companion) is distinguished from him ; and this consideration alone appears

cuius laus est in evangelio per omnes ecclesias : ¹⁸ non solum autem, sed et ordinatus est ab ecclesiis comes peregrinationis	whose praise is in the gospel through all the churches : ¹⁸ and not that only, but he was also ordained by the
---	--

to exclude St. Luke, Barnabas, and Silas. Besides, since St. Paul was anxious to avoid all suspicion in connection with the money to be collected (v. 20), it is much more likely that this brother was a comparative stranger to him, rather than a companion or familiar disciple. If it be urged that the brother was appointed by the churches (v. 19), and not selected by St. Paul, we may reply that the Apostle was very probably consulted in regard to the appointment ; in any case, our first argument retains all its force.

If, as is probable, the churches referred to in v. 19 as having appointed the brother in question to be St. Paul's companion, be Macedonian churches, then we may perhaps look for "the brother" among the Macedonians (Sopater of Beroea, Aristarchus and Secundus of Thessalonica) who, we know, were actually among St. Paul's companions when he carried the alms from Corinth to Jerusalem (Acts xx. 4 ; xxiv. 17).

Many early writers identified the person referred to with St. Luke, because they understood "the Gospel" mentioned in this verse of our Third Gospel, and took the sense to be : whose praise for the Gospel he has written is through all the churches. But it is now generally agreed, and rightly, that the reference is not to a *written* Gospel, but to the gospel as *preached* : "whose praise in the matter of preaching the Gospel is spread through all the churches." For a similar use of "in the Gospel" (ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ) see x. 14 ; Phil. iv. 3 ; 1 Thess. iii. 2, and compare Phil. iv. 15 ; 1 Cor. ix. 18.

19. And not only is he generally praised, but he was specially appointed by the churches (probably of Macedonia) to travel with us in connection with this matter of alms. Both facts were calculated to gain a good reception at Corinth for the brother in question.

"He was also ordained, etc." The verb χειροτονεῖν is used in only one other passage of the New Testament, Acts xiv. 22 (Gr. 23), where Paul and Barnabas are said to have appointed "presbyters" in every church. In later ecclesiastical Greek it was the usual word employed to signify sacramental ordination by the imposition of hands ; but etymologically (χείρ, "hand,"

nostrae, in hanc gratiam quae ministratur a nobis ad Domini gloriam, et destinatam volun- churches companion of our travels, for this grace, which is administered by us to the glory

and *τεῖνω*, "I stretch out") and in classical Greek it means "to vote by show of hands," then "to elect by show of hands," and in general, to elect or appoint. Doubtless sacramental ordination is supposed in Acts xiv. 22, whether it be connoted by the use of this verb or not, for the superiors there appointed were to celebrate the Blessed Eucharist, administer the other Sacraments, and preside over the churches. It seems probable, however, that even in Acts *χαρτοῦναι* does not refer to ordination, but to nomination; and that ordination is referred to in the words immediately following: "and had prayed with fasting." Compare Acts xiii. 3, where Paul and Barnabas, after having been nominated by the Holy Ghost, were ordained as Bishops: "Then they, fasting and praying and imposing their hands upon them, sent them away."

In the present passage there is no good reason for thinking that there is question of sacramental ordination, even to deaconship; in fact the form of expression seems to exclude it, for the brother is said to have been "ordained" *by the churches* to travel with Paul in connection with the collection, and though we know from Acts vi. that the Order of Deacons was established at a very early period, and that Deacons were intended, among other and more sacred duties, to look after temporal matters, yet ordination *by the churches* would be a strange way of describing sacramental ordination with the approval of the churches.

"For this grace." Rather "in" or "with" this grace, the authorities being divided between *ἐν* and *σύν* with the dative. In the first case the "grace" is the charitable work of making the collection and conveying it to Jerusalem, in the latter, it is the fruit of the liberality of the Corinthians, *i.e.*, the collection itself *with* which they travelled.

"To the glory of the Lord, and our determined will"; R.V. "To the glory of the Lord, and to show our readiness." Some connect this clause with *χαρτοῦντες*, understanding that the brother was appointed as a companion to St. Paul to promote the glory of the Lord, and encourage the Apostle to make the collection. But it seems better to connect with "which is administered by us," the sense being that the collection was made to promote the glory of the Lord by showing the charity of

tatem nostram : ²⁰ devitantes hoc, ne quis nos vituperet in hac plenitudine quae ministratur a nobis. ²¹ Providemus enim bona non solum coram Deo, sed etiam coram hominibus. ²² Misimus autem cum illis et fratrem nostrum, quem probavimus in multis saepe sollicitum esse : nunc autem multo sollicitiorem, confidentia multa in vos, ²³ Sive pro Tito,

of the Lord, and our determined will : ²⁰ avoiding this lest any man should blame us in this abundance which is administered by us. ²¹ For we forecast what may be good not only before God, but also before men. ²² And we have sent with them our brother also, whom we have often proved diligent in many things : but now much more diligent, with much confidence in you. ²³ Either for

Christians for each other, and to show the zeal (προθυμῶν) of St. Paul for the poor Christians of Jerusalem.

20. Connect with " we have sent " (v. 18), the sense being that the Apostle now sends this independent delegate of the churches with Titus, to avoid all cause for suspicion that the money or part of it was being collected for his own private use.

" This abundance " is the large sum which he anticipated the collection would reach.

21. " For we forecast, etc." The same idea occurs in Rom. xii. 17, and in Prov. iii. 4 (LXX.). The sense is : for we take thought for, or are careful to do, things that are fine (καλά, stronger than " good ") not only in the sight of the Lord (κυρίου), but that are also fine in the sight of men. " ' Caesar's wife should be above suspicion,' and a priest's integrity : therefore it is well to have witnesses " (Rickaby).

22. Who this brother was, is also uncertain.—" With much confidence in you." The sense is that this brother, often proved zealous before, was now much more zealous *because* of his confidence in the Corinthians (inspired probably by the character Titus gave them). Estius, however, connects with " we have sent " and understands of St. Paul's confidence in the Corinthians : We have sent these three (Titus and the two " brothers ") with much confidence in you (v. 23), whether in regard to Titus or in regard to the others, that you will receive them worthily.

23. Estius' view of the connection of this verse with the preceding is clear from what has just been said. We prefer, however, with Cornely and others to put a full stop after " much confidence in you," and to understand the present verse as follows : Whether there be question of Titus, he (" qui " of Vulg. must be omitted)

qui est socius meus, et in vos adiutor, sive fratres nostri, apostoli ecclesiarum, gloria Christi. ²⁴ Ostensionem ergo, quae est charitatis vestrae, et nostrae gloriae pro vobis, in illos ostendite in faciem ecclesiarum.

Titus, who is my companion and fellow-labourer towards you, or our brethren, the apostles of the churches, the glory of Christ. ²⁴ Wherefore shew ye to them, in the sight of the churches, the evidence of your charity, and of our boasting on your behalf.

is my companion and fellow-labourer towards you, or whether *our* (your and my) brethren be in question, they are the legates of the churches, the glory of Christ. For the construction εἰς—εἰς, cf. 1 Cor. xiii. 8.

This is one of the few passages of the New Testament where ἀπόστολος is applied to any besides the Apostles of Christ (cf. Phil. ii. 25). It is used here in its primitive sense of messenger or legate, "one sent." The two legates of the churches are said to be "the glory of Christ," because Christ was in a special way honoured and glorified by their zealous and edifying lives.

24. In Vulg. omit "quae est," and for "gloriae" read "glorificationis." "The churches" are those by which the legates were sent, probably those of Macedonia, and the sense of the verse is: Wherefore show them in the sight (εἰς πρόσωπον) of the churches the *proof* of your charity and of the justice of our boasting in your regard, i.e., receive them worthily, and respond generously to their appeal. Instead of the Imperative, B D E F G have the Participle ἐνδεικνύμενοι, which is very likely to be correct. The Participle would have an Imperative force, implying also duration of the action: wherefore *keep* showing them, etc. Cf. J. H. Moulton, *Proleg.*, pp. 180-181.

CHAPTER IX

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

Having commended the collectors, he now turns to speak again of the collection, while admitting that no exhortation is needed to commend it, seeing the readiness of the Corinthians (vv. 1-2). But he has sent the brethren to expedite it, that it may be worthily completed before he comes to Corinth (3-5). Exhortation to give generously and with good dispositions (6-7) ; God is able to make an abundant return to them, that they may abound unto every good work, like the righteous man spoken of by the Psalmist, whose alms-giving issues in eternal righteousness (8-9). Not only is God able, but He will actually give them an abundant return (10), so that they may be able to continue their generous contributions, and so bring about thanksgiving to God (10-11). Salutary effects of their charity : relief of the poor, thanksgiving to God, while the recipients of the alms glorify God for the faith and liberality of the Corinthians, and for their own prayerful acknowledgment thereof, and are filled with grateful affection (12-14). Thanks to God for the anticipated liberality of the Corinthians (15).

¹ NAM de ministerio, quod fit in sanctos, ex abundanti est mihi scribere vobis. ² Scio enim promptum animum vestrum : pro quo de vobis glorior apud Macedones. Quoniam et

¹ FOR concerning the ministry, that is done towards the saints, it is superfluous for me to write unto you. ² For I know your forward mind : for which I boast of you to the

1. The Apostle now turns to speak again (cf. viii. 7, 11, 14) of the collection itself. He has commended the collectors, for indeed as regards the collection itself, it is superfluous for him to commend it. The next verse states why it is superfluous. Τῆς διακονίας is literally "the ministering" to the Christians of Jerusalem through the collection.

2. In the Vulgate text omit the full stop after "Macedones," also "et" before Achaia ; and similarly in our English version. "Quoniam" too is misleading, the *ὅτι* which it represents, serving merely to introduce the boast. Render : "For I know your readiness, of which I boast of you to the Macedonians, (saying) Achaia is ready since last year." On Achaia, see above on i. 1.

Achaia parata est ab anno praeterito, et vestra aemulatio provocavit plurimos. ² Misi autem fratres : ut ne quod gloriamur de vobis, evacuetur in hac parte, ut (quemadmodum dixi) parati sitis : ⁴ Ne cum venerint Macedones mecum, et invenerint vos imparatos, erubescamus nos (ut non dicamus vos) in hac substantia. ⁵ Necessarium ergo existimavi rogare fratres, ut

Macedonians. That Achaia also is ready from the year past, and your emulation hath provoked very many. ³ Now I have sent the brethren, that the thing which we boast of concerning you be not made void in this behalf, that (as I have said) you may be ready : ⁴ Lest when the Macedonians shall come with me, and find you unprepared, we (not to say ye) should be ashamed in this matter. ⁵ Therefore I thought

"Is ready" need not be understood merely of intentions, as opposed to deeds ; they had made the collection partially, and were willing to complete it (viii. 10).

"And your emulation." This is not part of the boast, but an independent statement. If, with many authorities, we read τὸ (or ὁ) ὑμῶν ζῆλος, the meaning will be : "and your zeal stimulated very many" (literally, "the majority") ; if, with many others, ὁ ἐξ ὑμῶν ζῆλος : "and the emulation provoked by you stimulated very many."

3. The δὲ here answers to μὲν (v. 1) : for it is indeed superfluous for me to commend the collection, but I have sent the brethren to hurry it up.

"That the thing which we boast of, etc." Καύχημα primarily means "matter for boasting," but here, as in v. 12 ; 1 Cor. v. 6, "boasting" itself : "that our boasting concerning you may not be shown to be without justification in this matter" (of your readiness). The remainder of the verse merely explains this : "that, even as I said (you were), you may be ready." The brackets in the Vulgate and our English version are unnecessary.

4. For "lest when," read "lest if" (μήποτε ἐάν)—"In this matter." So our version, with many other authorities, understands the clause ἐν τῇ ὑποστάσει ταύτῃ ; but very many moderns prefer "in this confidence," understanding the meaning to be : lest we (not to say ye) should be put to shame in the matter of this confidence (which we had in ye) ; we, for being disappointed ; you, for having disappointed us. For this latter sense of ὑπόστασις cf. Ps. xxxviii. 8 ; Ezech. xix. 5 (LXX.).

5. "Blessing" ; so he calls their contribution, insinuating by

præveniant ad vos, et præparent repromissam benedictionem hanc paratam esse, sic quasi benedictionem, non tamquam avaritiam.

⁶ Hoc autem dico : Qui parce seminat, parce et metet : et qui seminat in benedictionibus, de benedictionibus et metet. ⁷ Unusquisque prout destinavit in

it necessary to desire the brethren that they would go to you before, and prepare this blessing before promised, to be ready, so as a blessing, not as covetousness.

⁶ Now this I say : He who soweth sparingly, shall also reap sparingly : and he who soweth in blessings, shall also reap of blessings. ⁷ Every one as he hath determined in his

the very word that it should be given generously and freely, as he proceeds to urge in the next two verses. Εὐλογία which primarily means an expression of good will, is used in the LXX. for a gift (*e.g.*, Gen. xxxiii. 11), as here of an alms, perhaps because a gift or an alms is the expression in *act* of good will.

"To be ready, etc.," *i.e.*, that it (rather, "the same," τούτην) may be ready, so as a free gift, and not as an extortion, a thing extorted from you (πλωσιζόν). This sense of πλεονεξία agrees well with the sense of the corresponding verb in xii. 16-18, but if we attend to the sense of ἐπ' εὐλογίαις ("bountifully") in the next verse here, it would seem that the more probable meaning of the present clause is : that it may be ready as a bounteous offering and not as a niggardly one ("in quo cernitur avaritia," Grimm).

6. "In blessings . . . blessings." In both cases the Greek has ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, and the contrast with "sparingly," shows that "generously," "abundantly" (according to their means), is meant ("ἐπ' εὐλογίαις, ut adsint beneficia, *i.e.*, largiter," Grimm), so that the sense is : "he that soweth abundantly, shall also reap abundantly," *i.e.*, he that giveth abundantly, shall be abundantly rewarded hereafter. The metaphor implies that as the harvest arises by physical connection from the sowing, so the eternal reward follows by moral connection, based upon God's gratuitous promises, from the good work ; and this is the Catholic doctrine of merit.

7. The contribution must be not only generous according to their means, but also given with good dispositions. Let each one (give), according as he hath *freely decided* (read προήρηται, not the Present προουπέρτα) in his heart, not from sadness or from necessity, *i.e.*, not regretfully or unwillingly (forced by motives of human respect, etc.), for God loveth a cheerful giver. The

corde suo, non ex tristitia, aut ex necessitate: hilarem enim datorem diligit Deus. * Potens est autem Deus omnem gratiam abundare facere in vobis: ut in omnibus semper omnem sufficientiam habentes, abundetis in omne opus bonum, * Sicut scriptum est: Dispersit, dedit pauperibus iustitia eius manet

heart, not with sadness or of necessity: *For God loveth a cheerful giver.* * And God is able to make all grace abound in you: that ye always having all sufficiency in all things may abound to every good work. * As it is written: *He hath dispersed abroad, He hath given to the poor: His justice remaineth*

last words allude to Prov. xxii. 8 (LXX.) ἀνδρα λαρόν καὶ δότην εὐλογεῖ ὁ θεός, "God blesseth a man cheerful and a giver." Cf. Rom. xii. 8; Eccles. xxxv. 11.

8. To drive out every feeling of niggardliness or sadness or unwillingness, he now adds: "And God is able to *make every* grace abound *unto you*, etc." By "every grace," it would seem from the context, temporal blessings are chiefly meant, but the expression is so comprehensive that spiritual blessings may also be included. The remarkable accumulation, πᾶσαν ἐν παντί, πάντοτε, πᾶσαν, πᾶν strengthens the meaning in a very striking way.

"Sufficiency" is not merely subjective sufficiency, or contentment, but objective sufficiency, so that they may have wherewith to give. God is able to give this, and it is implied that He will, if He sees it is for our good.

9. The text quoted from the Psalm beginning *Beatus vir qui timet Dominum*, is spoken not of God but of the righteous man who gives freely to the poor. "He hath dispersed." The Greek verb means to scatter, as in *sowing*, agreeably to the metaphor of v. 7. Some understand "his justice remaineth forever" in the sense that his *beneficence* is never exhausted, God always supplying him with new resources: This would indeed suit the context well, but it gives a forced sense to "justice" (δικαιοσύνη). We take it that this verse is not meant to *prove* the preceding, but to exhort to the fulfilment of its last words: "that ye may abound unto every good work." The meaning is: that ye may abound unto every good work, like the man of whom the Psalmist speaks, who gives generously to the poor, and whose righteousness remaineth forever. Thus the text is quoted because the Psalmist expects almsgiving of the just man and implies that eternal righteousness is the result of his charity. "Saeculi" of Vulg. must be omitted here according to the best authorities.

in saeculum saeculi. ¹⁰ Qui autem administrat semen seminanti: et panem ad manducandum praestabit, et multiplicabit semen vestrum, et augebit incrementa frugum iustitiae vestrae: ¹¹ Ut in omnibus locupletati abundetis in omnem simplicitatem, quae operatur per nos gratiarum

for ever. ¹⁰ And He that ministereth seed to the sower, will both give you bread to eat, and will multiply your seed, and increase the growth of the fruits of your justice: ¹¹ That being enriched in all things, you may abound unto all simplicity, which worketh through us

10. What is now said, adds to what was said in v. 8. Not only is God *able* to supply a sufficiency, but experience teaches that He will. In Isaiah lv. 10, it is said of the rain from heaven that it returneth not, until it "giveth seed to the sower and bread for eating," σπέρμα τῷ σπείποντι καὶ ἄρον εἰς βρώσιν, which are the exact words of St. Paul here, so that he is probably quoting. In that case we must alter the punctuation of the verse, and understand: "And He that supplieth seed to the sower and bread for eating, shall supply and multiply your seed, and increase, etc."

"The growth of the fruits of your justice." This represents the Vulg. "incrementa frugum," but the Greek has only τὰ γνήμματα τῆς δικ., "the fruits of your justice." The Vulg. seems to combine two different interpretations of γνήμματα, viz., "increases" and "fruits." By the fruits of their justice he means a sufficiency in temporal things, and also probably an eternal reward, granted to them on account of their righteousness (as manifested in their almsgiving). The Apostle is speaking of God's ordinary providence, which usually rewards virtue even in this life with a sufficiency.

11. "Ut" of Vulg. and "abundetis" are not represented in the Greek, but they complete the sense. Here and in v. 13 J. H. Moulton (*Proleg.* i., p. 181) takes the Greek Participles as equivalent to Imperatives, but we should then expect οὖν or some such particle (cf. viii. 24); moreover, the whole context is against an Imper. sense here, while such a sense is impossible in v. 13, where the participle refers, not to the Corinthians, but to those who will glorify God for their action. Better to connect the Participle, as some do, with "that ye may abound" of v. 8, or to take it as hanging loosely in the Nominative *pendens*, as it is sometimes called. So apparently the Revised Version, which renders: "ye being enriched in everything, etc." For similar

actionem Deo. ¹² Quoniam ministerium huius officii, non solum supplet ea quae desunt sanctis, sed etiam abundat per multas gratiarum actiones in Domino. ¹³ Per probationem ministerii huius, glorificantes

thanksgiving to God. ¹² Because the administration of this office doth not only supply the want of the saints, but aboundeth also by many thanksgivings in the Lord, ¹³ By the proof of this ministry, glorifying God

loose constructions, see v. 13; i. 7; Col. ii. 2, etc., and cf. Cornely on this verse.

The connection and meaning seem to be: (v. 10) God shall increase the fruits of your justice, (so that you may be) enriched unto all simplicity. There is the same difference of opinion here as in viii. 2 about the meaning of the word rendered "simplicity" (ἀπλότης). See above on viii. 2.

"Which worketh, etc." The meaning is that their pure-minded or liberal contribution, when delivered by the Apostle to the poor will produce thanksgiving to God, an aspect of the question to which he devotes the next verse.

12. He proceeds to explain the last clause of the preceding verse.

In this and the next three verses the Apostle throws himself forward to the time when the alms would be received at Jerusalem, and the gratitude of the Jews would be manifest, and the union of Jewish and Gentile Churches thus further cemented. Διὰκονία is to be understood here as in ix. 1 of "the ministering," or providing of the alms. Τῆς λατρυπίας denotes the contribution collected, which is thus represented as a *public* and *sacred* offering. "Graecum vocabulum λατρυπία enim, quo profani scriptores publicum munus a viro propriis sumptibus obeundum significant, ab Alexandrinis de solo sacro munere, quo sacerdotes in sanctuario funguntur, usurpatur atque simili sensu etiam a Novi Test. scriptoribus semper adhibetur" (Cornely, who adds a note in support of this view). "The administration" is held by some to refer to the part of the Corinthians in furnishing the alms, by others to St. Paul's part in organising and conveying them.

"By many thanksgivings." The Greek is ambiguous and may mean "by the thanksgivings of many" (people). "In" before "Domino" in Vulg. must be omitted, and for "Domino" read "Deo" (τῷ θεῷ); "thanksgivings to God" is the meaning.

13. This and the next verse explain the nature and occasion of the thanksgivings just spoken of. As in v. 11, the syntax is

Deum in obedientia confessionis vestrae, in evangelium Christi, et simplicitate communicationis in illos, et in omnes, ¹³ Et in ipsorum obsecratione pro vobis, desiderantium vos propter eminentem

for the obedience of your confession unto the gospel of Christ, and for the simplicity of *your* communicating unto them, and unto all, ¹⁴ And in their praying for you, being desirous of you because of the

again loose, for we might have expected, instead of the Nominative δοξάζοντες, the Gen. δοξάζόντων, either as a Gen. Absolute, or in agreement with πολλῶν of v. 12. Understanding "the proof of this ministry" in the sense of "the proof of your charity afforded by this ministering," and resolving the Participle into an Indicative, we get the sense: "Whilst, through the proof of your charity afforded by this ministering, they glorify God for the obedience of your confession unto the Gospel of Christ, and for the liberality (or 'simplicity') of your communicating unto them and unto all."

14. Many think that a third matter for which the recipients of the alms glorify God is here added. He has represented them as glorifying God on account of the faith, and the liberality of the Corinthians, and now adds that they will glorify Him also on account of their own prayers for the Corinthians, those prayers being recognised by them as a sign of charity and a result of God's grace. Such is probably the sense of the Vulgate. But as it seems rather strange that they should glorify God for their own prayers, others connect this with "aboundeth also" (v. 12), the meaning being that the alms would abound not only in the thanksgivings and glorification of God referred to in v. 13, but also in the prayer of the poor people of Jerusalem for the Corinthians. But against this it may be urged that we ought then to have θεήσεως in the Genitive, depending, like εὐχαριστιῶν on διὰ of v. 12. Hence others, taking ἐπιπροσθύντων here as a Genitive Absolute, connect with the preceding and understand as follows: "they glorify God for your faith and liberality, while they themselves also, with supplication on your behalf, long after you, etc." But this use of the Genitive Absolute, after the employment of the Nominative in v. 13, is not without difficulty. On the whole, the first view appears the most satisfactory.

"Being desirous of you"; ἐπιπροσθύντων seems to refer to an eager feeling of affection, as in Phil. i. 8; ii. 26.

"The excellent (or 'surpassing') grace of God" is the grace

gratiam Dei in vobis. ¹⁵ Gratias	excellent grace of God in you.
Deo super inenarrabili dono	¹⁵ Thanks be to God for His
eius.	unspeakable gift.

of Christian liberality, which he expects, and in expecting exhorts, the Corinthians to manifest in a remarkable degree.

15. Filled with the thought of all the good effects which will follow from this liberality—the alleviation of the wants of the poor, the glory redounding to God, the prayers offered for the contributors, the affection for them enkindled in the recipients, which would promote the union of Jews and Gentiles in the Church (*vv.* 12–14)—the Apostle breaks forth into thanks to God for this liberality, which he recognises as a *gift* of God, a gift which words are powerless to describe. Or it may be that he is thinking of the gift of faith, the foundation and source of this Christian liberality.

CHAPTER X

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

He appeals to the Corinthians generally (see verse 6) not to force him to use severe measures when he comes among them, measures such as he is thinking of using against some who judged of him and his fellow-labourers as walking according to the flesh (vv. 1-2). That they did not exercise their ministry according to the flesh, he shows by the arms they used (3-4a), and by the nature and aims of their spiritual campaign (4b-6). He appeals to what is evident, namely, that no false apostle has any real advantage over himself and Timothy (7); and even if he make further claims, they shall not prove to be unfounded (8). Alluding to a charge made against him by his adversaries, he says that his letters are no stronger than his action shall be when he comes among them (9-11). He and Timothy will not number or compare themselves with the false apostles who commend themselves and lack understanding (12), but will glory only in the work which God gave them to do, a work reaching even to the Corinthians (13-14); not glorying in other men's labours, but hoping to carry the Gospel farther West than Corinth into new ground (15-16). Finally he says that all ought to glory in the Lord, for otherwise they shall not be commended by the Lord (17-18).

¹ Ipse autem ego Paulus
obsecro vos, per mansuetu-
dinem et modestiam Christi,
qui in facie quidem humilis sum

¹ Now I Paul myself beseech
you, by the mildness and
modesty of Christ, who in
presence indeed am lowly

The Apostle now passes to the third section of the Epistle, in which he warmly defends himself against the charges made against him by the false teachers at Corinth. The whole atmosphere changes, and the tone of apology and affection now gives place to one of indignation and menace.

1. The **¶** does not denote any opposition, but merely indicates, as in viii. 1, the transition to a new subject. The emphatic reference to himself in the words "now I Paul myself" (cf. Gal. v. 2; Philem. 19; Eph. iii. 1, the only other passages where a similar mention of his own name occurs) fitly opens a section that deals so much with his own individual life and character;

inter vos, absens autem confido in vobis. ² Rogo autem vos ne praesens audeam, per eam confidentiam qua existimor audere, in quosdam qui arbitrantur nos tanquam secundum carnem ambulemus. ³ In carne enim ambulantes, non secun-

among you, but being absent am bold toward you. ² But I beseech you, that I may not be bold when I am present, with that confidence wherewith I am thought to be bold, against some, who reckon us as if we walked according to the flesh. ³ For though we walk in the flesh, we do not war

and serves to set vividly before the readers the person accused by his adversaries. It is as if he said: Now I, that Paul, who is accused of making empty boasts.

For "modesty," better "clemency"; see Acts xxiv. 4; 1 Pet. ii. 18. The words that follow: "who in presence, etc.," allude to one of the charges made against him by his adversaries. Τερνίς must be understood in a bad sense: "mean," "contemptible," rather than "lowly." The Vulg. "confido in vobis" ought to be "audax sum in vos" ("bold toward you"); "confido" was never used in the bad sense required here.

2. In the preceding verse the sense was left incomplete, as the Apostle did not say what it was he besought of them. He now resumes with θέλω δέ, strengthening the appeal: "nay, I beg of you." The substance of the two verses, therefore, is that he appeals to them by the meekness and clemency of Christ (the very nature of this appeal showing that he does not wish to be severe), not to force him when present among them to be bold against them with that boldness which he was accused of showing when absent.

"Wherewith I am thought, etc." This supposes that λογίζουαι is used passively; but it may well be a deponent verb, with an active sense, as in λογιζομένους, a few words after and in v. 7, and the meaning then is, as St. Chrysostom and many others understand: "wherewith I am thinking of being bold against some, who reckon us, etc.;" i.e., force me not to be bold against all or most of you with that boldness which I am thinking of showing against some, etc.

3. He now takes up and rejects the estimate which some had of himself and Timothy (note the change to the first *plural*) and possibly other ministers of the Gospel, namely, that they "walked according to the flesh." *In* the flesh indeed they are, he admits (as the Apostles were *in* the world though not *of* it. John

dum carnem militamus. ⁴ Nam arma militiae nostrae non carnalia sunt, sed potentia Deo ad destructionem munitionum, consilia destruentes, ⁵ Et omnem altitudinem extollentem se adversus scientiam Dei, et in captivitatem redigentes omnem intellectum in obsequium

according to the flesh. ⁴ For the weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty to God unto the pulling down of fortifications, destroying counsels. ⁵ And every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringeth into captivity every understanding unto

xvii. 11, 16), but they did not walk according to the flesh, or, as he prefers to put it, they did not war according to the flesh, i.e., they did not exercise their ministry according to the standards or ways of the carnal man. See above on i. 17, and cf. Rom. viii. 1, 4, 5, 12, 13.

4. That such was not the character of their warfare, he now shows from the character of the arms they used. These arms were "not carnal," i.e., they were not weak human arms, but mighty *before* God, or perhaps *through* God for the destruction of fortifications. Seeing that the opposition is between "carnal" and "mighty" arms, the weakness of the former is connoted, and the spirituality of the latter. The "fortifications" meant are probably not merely sophisms or arguments, but obstacles of every kind to the spread of the Gospel.

"Destroying counsels" (rather "reasonings," i.e., confuting the wisdom of the world, 1 Cor. iii. 19-20). This ought to stand in v. 5. Since the participle *καταρπύοντες* is masculine, it agrees, not with *ὅπλα* ("arms"), but with "we," the subject of v. 3, so that the clause: "for the arms . . . fortifications" is parenthetical. Estius and others, however, reject the parenthesis here as obscuring the sense, and take the meaning to be: with which arms we destroy counsels: "Quare illud: *consilia destruentes*, ita accipe, quasi dictum sit, quibus armis consilia destruimus" (Estius).

5. The "height" or "high thing" may refer to every intellectual obstacle to the knowledge of God and the spread of the Gospel, or more generally, like "fortifications" (v. 4), to every kind of obstacle, *πάν ὑψωμα ἐπαυρόμενον* being literally "every rampart raised up" (cf. Grimm on *ὑψωμα*).

"And bringing into captivity, etc." In their spiritual campaign, St. Paul and his companions not only conquered obstacles, but also made captive every mind (for *νῆμα* see above on ii. 11)

Christi, ⁶ Et in promptu habentes ulcisci omnem inobedientiam, cum impleta fuerit vestra obedientia.

⁷ Quae secundum faciem sunt, videte. Si quis confidit sibi Christi se esse, hoc cogitet iterum apud se : quia sicut ipse

the obedience of Christ, ⁶ And having in readiness to revenge all disobedience, when your obedience shall be fulfilled.

⁷ See the things that are according to outward appearance. If any man trust to himself, that he is Christ's, let him think this again with himself, that as he is Christ's so are

unto obedience to Christ. It is not meant of course that they actually succeeded in every case, but the Apostle is pointing out the nature and aims of the warfare in which they were engaged (v. 3). By "obedience to Christ" is meant faith, represented here, it would seem, as a fortress, into which his prisoners were to be carried. Texts like this (cf. Rom. i. 5 ; Acts vi. 7, etc.) show that in faith, besides the act of the intellect, there is an act of the will submitting itself and commanding the intellect to give its assent. Faith then is a free act, the evidence for it not being such as to compel the intellect. The will freely determines itself to obedience, and commands the intellect to accept on Divine authority the truths proposed, and therein lies the obedience of faith.

6. "And having in readiness, etc." Rather "and *being* ready." The verse shows that the Apostle was waiting to punish every disobedience (this is so general that it may cover the disobedience of heretics, schismatics or other great sinners), until the bulk of the Corinthians had returned to complete obedience. The punishment alluded to is of course spiritual punishment, such as excommunication ; and those to be subjected to it were Christians, for we know from 1 Cor. v. 12 that the Apostle did not make any claim to a right to judge those outside the Church. The verse shows the necessity of caution and the inadvisability of severe measures, as long as the majority of the people are on the side of error, for in such case severe measures do more harm than good ; as St. Augustine says : "*plus perturbant infirmos bonos quam corrigunt animoscos malos*" (Ad Parmen. iii. 2-13 sq.).

7. The connection of thought with the preceding seems to be : such really is the warfare in which we are engaged, such the power and authority with which we have been endowed (vv. 3-6), but if you still hesitate as between the claims of our adversaries and

Christi est, ita et nos. * Nam, et si amplius aliquid gloriatus fuero de potestate nostra, quam dedit nobis Dominus in aedificationem, et non in destructionem vestram, non erubesc-

we also. * For if also I should boast somewhat more of our power, which the Lord hath given us unto edification, and not for your destruction; I

us, as if they had any advantage over us, look at (βλέπετε) what lies open before you, what stares you in the face—our inferiority to them in no respect. This supposes, with the Vulg., that βλέπετε is to be taken imperatively; it also regards τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον as meaning "the things that are before your face" (cf. Luke ii. 31; Acts iii. 13). But the line of thought will be the same if βλέπετε be taken interrogatively and τὰ κατὰ πρόσωπον as meaning "the things that are according to outward appearances": "Do ye look at external advantages?" Even so, we are able to bear comparison. Others take βλέπετε affirmatively: "ye look," but with less probability, we think.

"If any man trust to himself"; rather "confide in himself, etc." This is one of the evident things that he has just invited them to look at or, in the second view, one of the external advantages, in case they prefer to look at these. The meaning is, that if any one confided in himself as being Christ's, such a person ought to think again *with himself* (read ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ with B & L It., Vulg. rather than ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ: *of himself*, without forcing Paul to convince him), that as he is Christ's, so also are Paul and Timothy. The exact relation to Christ intended is not expressed, but it seems far more likely that there is question, not merely of being a member of Christ like one of the ordinary faithful, but of being a minister of Christ for the preaching of the Gospel (cf. xi. 23). Whether the phrase "if any man" points to a definite individual, must remain uncertain. That there cannot be reference to a member of a *faction* at Corinth calling itself Christ's, see on 1 Cor. i. 12, where it is shown that no such faction existed.

8. "For even if" (ἐάν τι γάρ), omitting "also," as καί after γάρ is most probably not genuine. He has just said that he and Timothy are ministers of Christ, as much as their adversaries; he now says that if he should make further claims, as he will very emphatically later on in reference to himself, xi. 23 ff., he shall not be put to shame through such claims being proved to be unfounded.

Though Paul and his fellow-ministers had power and authority

cam. ⁸ Ut autem non existimer tanquam terrere vos per epistolae : ¹⁰ (Quoniam quidem epistolae, inquit, graves sunt et fortes : praesentia autem corporis infirma et sermo con-

should not be ashamed. ⁸ But that I may not be thought as it were to terrify you by epistles, ¹⁰ (For his epistles indeed, say they, are weighty and strong ; but His bodily presence is weak,

for the " destruction of fortifications " (v. 4), their power in reference to the Corinthians was given for building up the church there, and each of its members, and not for destruction. The same word, καθάρειν is used here as in v. 4.

9. Many connect this with the preceding, understanding something to be left unexpressed, such as : " But I will not make any further claims, that I may not be thought, etc." It is better and simpler, however, to take this verse, with the Vulg. and our English version, as the *protasis* of a new sentence, of which v. 11 is the *apodosis*, v. 10 being parenthetical. The sense of the three verses is : That I may not seem as if I wished to terrify you by my letters, while there is no real power or strength behind them (for his epistles indeed, *says he*, are authoritative and severe, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech of no account), let such a one reckon that our letters when we are absent, are no stronger than our action shall be when we are present.

The " but " at the beginning of this verse, and the corresponding " autem " of the Vulg., are very suspect.

The ὡς ἐν followed by the Infinitive, which occurs only here in the New Testament, is to be understood as above : " tanquam qui velim vos terrere " (Beel. Gr. Gr., p. 344). The mention of " epistles " hardly proves that the Apostle had written *more* than one epistle to them before this time, as the plural might possibly be used generically as denoting the *character* of his written communications, though only one had been received ; but the natural conclusion from the use of the plural is that more than one had already been received, and we know otherwise that this was so, for he had already written the letter now lost (1 Cor. v. 9), and our present First Epistle to the Corinthians.

10. Instead of the plural φασίν (" say they ") all the authorities except B, Vulg., Syr., Goth. support the singular, φησίν, which probably points to a definite individual at the head of St. Paul's opponents in Corinth. Compare " such a one " in the next verse, and its application to a definite individual in ii. 7 and xii. 2.

" His bodily presence is weak." Tradition represents Paul as

temptibilis) : ¹¹ Hoc cogitet qui eiusmodi est, quia quales sumus verbo per epistolas absentes, tales et praesentes in facto.

¹² Non enim audemus inserere, aut comparare nos quibusdam, qui seipsos commendant : sed ipsi in nobis nosmetipsos metientes, et comparantes nos-

and His speech contemptible).

¹¹ Let such a one think this, that such as we are in word by epistles, when absent ; such also we *will* be in deed when present.

¹² For we dare not match, or compare ourselves with some, that commend themselves : but we measure ourselves by ourselves, and compare ourselves

small and stooping, but it is the unimpressiveness of his bodily *presence*, his general behaviour, when among them, rather than his physical appearance, that seems to be chiefly intended. In speaking of his speech as of no account, his opponents probably did not refer to the matter of his discourses, but to the form as lacking classic elegance. Cf. 1 Cor. ii. 1.

11. It is very possible that the occurrence of the singular "such a one" in this verse may have caused the plural $\phi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ to be changed to $\epsilon\phi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ in v. 10 by some early scribe.

"Absentes" of the Vulg. of course does not agree with "epistolas," as is made clear by our English version.

12. He has just repelled the suspicion of vain boasting (v. 11), and he now proceeds to repel it still further, at the same time charging it against his adversaries, who gloried in what were the labours of others. The words : "for we dare not" are ironical. "Match" is hardly the exact sense of $\epsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\alpha\iota$, which rather means "to number with" ; so that when it is taken with the following $\sigma\upsilon\gamma\kappa\lambda\iota\nu\alpha\iota$, we get the sense that he neither *counts* himself as one of them, nor even *compares* himself *with* them.

"But we measure ourselves, etc." In all probability our English version, following the Vulg., fails to give the true sense ; and the reference in $\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ and $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ is not to Paul and Timothy, but to the Apostle's adversaries at Corinth, as seems clear from the opposition between this and the emphatic "but we," of v. 13. Both the Vulg. and our version fail to take any account of two words : $\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\alpha\iota\sigma\iota\nu$, or (what is only another form of the third plural indic.) $\alpha\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu\iota\omicron\upsilon\sigma\iota\nu$ ("do not understand"). Reading these two words, as we must, the clause means : but they measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves with themselves, lack understanding (cf. Mark vi. 52 ; vii. 14 ; viii. 17). But we, etc.

metipsos nobis. ¹³ Nos autem non in immensum gloriabimur, sed secundum mensuram regulæ, qua mensus est nobis Deus, mensuram pertingendi usque

with ourselves. ¹³ But we will not glory beyond our measure ; but according to the measure of the rule, which God hath measured to us, a measure to

Several MSS. and Fathers omit not only the last two words of v. 12, which we have seen to be omitted by the Vulg. and our version, but also the first two of v. 13 : " But we." This reading, by removing the antithesis at the beginning of v. 13, will make the clause refer to St. Paul (and Timothy), as is clear from the following translation : " but we (*αὐτοί*, etc., may be either *first* or *third* person) measuring ourselves by ourselves, and comparing ourselves with ourselves, will not glory beyond our measure." This makes excellent sense, but the reading has slight support in comparison with that which inserts the four words in question.

If the form *συνιοῦσιν* were to be read rather than *συνιδῶσιν* (the reverse is in fact the case), it might be the dative plural of the partic., and the sense might then be : " but they measure themselves by themselves, and compare themselves with themselves, *not with people who have understanding*." This, however, requires that the preceding participles, " measuring," " comparing," be understood as finite verbs, and is not so probable as the first view set forth above, in which the participles are taken in their natural sense, and *οὐ συνιοῦσιν* or *οὐ συνιδῶσιν* as an indicative, meaning " are without understanding."

13. " Beyond *our* measure," i.e., in what has not been apportioned to us. Or the phrase may mean " beyond measure," i.e., " excessively."—" Which God hath measured to us." This agrees with a Greek reading *οὐ ἐπέτησεν*, but a much more probable reading is *οὐ ἐμέρισεν* (from *μέρος*, a part), " which God apportioned to us." We may render the whole verse : " But we will not glory beyond our measure, but according to the measure of the field which God apportioned to us as a measure, to reach even unto you." *Κανὼν* is primarily = measuring rod or tape, then the *space* measured, and so here the missionary field apportioned by God to St. Paul and his companions (cf. Grimm). We take *οὗ* to refer to *κανὼν* into the case of which it is attracted, and *μέτρον* to be in apposition to *οὗ* : which field God apportioned to us = measure. St. Paul was specially appointed Apostle of the Gentiles (Acts xxii. 21 ; ix. 15 ; Gal. ii. 7-9), the field of his labours was at least sometimes miraculously indicated to him (Acts

ad vos. ¹⁴ Non enim quasi non pertingentes ad vos, superextendimus nos : usque ad vos enim pervenimus in evangelio Christi ; ¹⁵ Non in immensum gloriantes in alienis laboribus : spem autem habentes crescentis fidei vestrae, in vobis magnificari secundum regulam nos-

reach even unto you. = For we stretch not out ourselves beyond our measure, as if we reached not unto you. For we are come as far as to you in the gospel of Christ. ¹⁵ Not glorying beyond measure in other men's labours ; but having hope of your increasing faith, to be magnified

xvi. 6-9), and he took care not to build upon another man's foundation (Rom. xv. 20) ; in all which respects he contrasted favourably with his adversaries at Corinth.

14. The meaning is that he (and Timothy) are not *now* outstepping the limits assigned to them, as they would be if they did not reach by Divine authority even to the Corinthians. The last clause, which may be rendered : " for as far as even to you we came in the Gospel of Christ," is thrown in parenthetically, to justify their present claims by their past labours in Corinth (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 15). It ought to be preceded by a comma, not a colon or a full stop. The aorist ἐφθάσαμεν in the primary sense of φθάνω would mean " we came first " (before the false apostles, cf. 1 Thess. iv. 15), and it is not unlikely that the Apostle meant this, though many think that it is used here in its later and more general sense of " we came."

15. Here he continues the contrast between himself and the false apostles. Αὐξανομένης τῆς πίστεως ὑμῶν is a genitive absolute, to be rendered in Latin " crescente fide vestra," in English " as your faith increases."

" To be magnified in you, etc." Some connect " in you " with what precedes : " as your faith increases among (or 'in') you," which would indeed facilitate the explanation of what follows, but seems tautological. Connecting " in you," then, with magnified, we understand this clause and the next verse thus : " having hope, as your faith increases, to have the sphere of our apostolic influence abundantly enlarged through you, in accordance with the wide commission we have got (literally, ' according to our allotted space '), so as to preach the Gospel to the places that are beyond you, and not to glory in a missionary field that is not ours, in regard to things ready to hand." Μεγαλύνω in the passive is used of growth in stature (cf. 1 Kings ii. 21), and here of growth in apostolic influence and efficacy ; εἰς περισσείαν (" abundantly ") we connect with it. Ἐν ὑμῖν probably means

tram in abundantiam, ¹⁶ Etiam in illa quae ultra vos sunt evangelizare, non in aliena regula in iis quae praeparata sunt gloriari. ¹⁷ Qui autem gloriatur, in Domino gloriatur. ¹⁸ Non enim qui seipsum commendat, ille probatus est : sed quem Deus commendat.

in you according to our rule abundantly. ¹⁶ Yea, unto those places that are beyond you, to preach the gospel, not to glory in another man's rule, in those things that are made ready to our hand. ¹⁷ But he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord. ¹⁸ For not he who commendeth himself is approved, but he whom God commendeth.

"through you"; as their faith increased, not only would he be set free from further labour in Corinth, but the fame of their church and of its founders would prepare the way for an extension of his apostolic labours to other places; and probably there is the hope that they would promote his further labours, if not by material help, at least by their prayers. For κατὰ τὸν κένον ἡμῶν see on v. 13.

16. The "places that are beyond you," would mean to a Jew like St. Paul places lying West of Corinth, and we know from Rom. xv. 24, written a few months after the present Epistle, that he had the intention of visiting Rome and even Spain.

By "things ready to our hand" are meant things or conditions that were due to the labours of others. This clause, like the first clause of v. 15, strikes at the false apostles in Corinth, who had come in to claim the fruits of the labours of St. Paul and his companions, and to boast in what they found ready to their hand.

17. See on 1 Cor. i. 31. The words show the spirit in which the Apostle has allowed himself to boast and in which he will boast further in what follows; they imply too that his adversaries were not glorying in the Lord.

18. It is implied, from the connection with v. 17, that the Lord (ὁ κύριος) commends not him who *glories in himself* and commends himself, but only him who glories in the Lord. By "the Lord" is probably meant not Christ but the Deity, as in the text of the prophet just quoted.

CHAPTER XI

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

About to praise himself though in self-defence, he claims indulgence (v. 1). Reasons why they ought to bear with him : on the one hand, his zeal for them ; on the other, his fear lest their faith be corrupted (2-3). They ought not to turn from him to the false teachers, for these have nothing valuable to impart, and St. Paul is not inferior to them ; though he might lack an elegant Greek style, he was not wanting in knowledge and candour (4-6). Surely they cannot complain because he preached to them without looking for support from them, depending on his own labour and the alms of other churches (7-9) ; at any rate he is determined to persevere in this course in Achaia, not because he does not love them, but because he wishes to deprive the false teachers of the opportunity of boasting equality with him in this matter (10-12). Deceit of the false apostles (13-16). He again craves indulgence, admitting that in what he is about to say he is departing from Christ's ordinary rule of conduct (16-17) ; but the boasting of others, and the toleration extended to them, make it necessary, and make him almost despise himself for his want of self-assertion (18-21a). But he has real matter for glorying as much as any of them, whether there be question of descent or of dignity as minister of Christ (21a-23). Nay, in this last respect he has superior claims, as he shows by the record of his labours and sufferings and perils endured as Christ's minister (24-33)

¹ UTINAM sustineretis modicum quid insipientiae meae, ¹ WOULD to God you could bear with some little of my

1. As he is about to declare his own praises, he begins by craving indulgence.

"Some little of my folly" (literally "with me in some little folly"); the "some little" perhaps alludes to the great deal of foolish boasting which they tolerated in his adversaries. "Boasting is folly; and to utter one's own praises has the appearance of boasting, even when it is done for grave cause, and, as here, under Divine inspiration; therefore St. Paul calls it by the name of that which it always resembles, and ordinarily is, a name no

sed et supportate me : ² Aemulor enim vos Dei aemulatione. Despondi enim vos uni viro virginem castam exhibere

folly : but do bear with me. ² For I am jealous of you with the jealousy of God. For I have espoused you to one husband, that I may present you as a

doubt which his enemies would be ready enough to apply to what he is going to say " (Rickaby).

" But do bear with me," or : " nay, do even bear with me." As the form (*δέχομαι*) may be either an indicative or an imperative, many take it here as an indicative, understanding the Apostle to correct himself, as it were : " Would to God you could . . . but indeed *you do* bear with me." But the imperative sense seems more probable, especially in view of v. 2, which appears to give a reason in support of the petition.

2. " The jealousy of God " is taken by some to mean a Godly or commendable jealousy, and not a vicious jealousy such as men sometimes experience ; by others as a jealousy *such as* God is represented as experiencing when the Jewish people whom He had espoused proved unfaithful to Him (Ezech. xvi. 8 ; Zach. i. 14, etc.), by others again as a jealousy *for* God, i.e., on God's or Christ's account, and not on his own. As Christ was the " sponsus," and St. Paul only the " amicus sponsi " (cf. John iii. 29), the Apostle could not be jealous on his own account.

" For I espoused you, etc." This clause and v. 3, taken together, explain why he is jealous ; on the one hand, as the *paranympheus*, or friend of the bridegroom, he had espoused them (*ἡμυοσύμην* is middle voice, used generally in reference to the bridegroom himself espousing his bride, but here, as sometimes elsewhere, e.g., Philo, *De Abr.*, pp. 15, 36, of the part played by his friend in arranging the espousals) to Christ, when he converted them to the faith ; on the other, there is danger that they may now be seduced from their fidelity to Christ. Hence it would be better not to put a full stop after v. 2. St. Paul had espoused the church of Corinth to Christ by faith and Baptism, and hoped to present it to Him on the day of judgment as a chaste virgin, chaste with the chastity of unblemished faith. There is allusion to the custom of espousals, and in *παράσπον* to the bringing home of the bride after a period of time to the bridegroom's house, and *setting her present* before him. The Apostle seems to represent the espousals here as a marriage, which was to be followed only by the solemn bringing home, for *ἐν ἑσπρί* can hardly mean anything else here than " to

Christo. ³ Timeo autem, ne sicut serpens Hevam seduxit astutia sua, ita corrumpantur sensus vestri, et excidant a simplicitate, quae est in Christo. ⁴ Nam si is qui venit, alium Christum praedicat, quem non praedicavimus: aut

chaste virgin to Christ. ³ But I fear lest, as the serpent seduced Eve by his subtilty, so your minds should be corrupted, and fall from the simplicity that is in Christ. ⁴ For if he that cometh preacheth another Christ, whom we have not

one *husband*." Had one person or spouse merely been meant, and not one *husband*, there was no need of ἀνδρί.

3. For the seduction of Eve by the serpent, see Gen. iii. 1-6. On that occasion the devil wrought through the serpent (cf. Apoc. xii. 9; xx. 2), as he now wrought through the false teachers at Corinth.

The Apostle therefore fears lest *perchance* (μήπως) the minds of the Corinthians may be corrupted (omit "and fall") from the simplicity *and the chastity* (the three words just italicised must be read—Gr. καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος) that is towards Christ, *i.e.*, from simple and uncorrupted faith in Christ. Of course any particular church, like that of Corinth, might fall away, though against the universal Church "the gates of Hell shall not prevail" (Matt. xvi. 18).

The fact, then, that the Corinthian Church had been espoused to Christ through the instrumentality of Paul, but was now in danger of corruption and infidelity to her spouse, was a reason why the Apostle should seek to rescue her from her danger, and hence a reason why the Corinthians should *bear with him* (v. 1), if for their sakes he praised himself and showed his superiority to the false apostles.

4. The connection, we think, is with v. 1: *Bear with me*, for indeed if (εἰ μὲν γάρ) any of these Judaizing teachers (cf. Gal. v. 10) brought you anything new and good, you might well *bear with* them. If they preached a *second Saviour* (ἄλλον Ἰησοῦν) or could impart a Spirit of a *different kind* (ἕτερον, see on 1 Cor. xii. 8-10) or a Gospel of a *different kind* (that was really a *glad tidings*), the Corinthians would do well to bear with them. It is implied of course that they could do none of these things, as there is only one Christ, one Spirit, and one Gospel (cf. Gal. i. 6-7; Eph. iv. 3-5). In this view καλῶς ἀνεχέσθε is the apodosis of a *conditional* sentence, for καλῶς ἂν ἀνεχέσθε (cf. Rom. vii. 7; John ix. 33; xv. 22). We might have expected a past tense instead

alium spiritum accipitis, quem non accepistis; aut aliud evangelium, quod non recepistis; recte pateremini. ² Existimo enim nihil me minus fecisse a

preached; or if you receive another Spirit, whom you have not received; or another gospel, which you have not received: you might well bear *with him*. ² For I suppose that I have

of "preacheth" in the protasis, but a present in such a sentence is not unexampled. Cf. Luke xvii. 6, and see Beel. Gr. Gr., p. 99.*

But there is another view of the passage, favoured by many moderns, which takes the sense to be: for if any one comes along with an *entirely different gospel*, you bear with him finely (the "finely" being ironical as in Mark vii. 9). But this view would require the present tense *ὀνείχεσθε* ("you bear with him"), which is supported only by B D, whereas the imperfect is supported by all other authorities. An attempt is indeed made in this view to explain the imperf., by saying that it is used to modify the severity of the statement, as if the Apostle did not refer to their present conduct but to their past; but if he meant that, he would surely have used a past tense, and not the present "preacheth" in the protasis of the sentence. What sense is there in: For if he that cometh, *preacheth*, you used to bear with him? In this latter view, the verse might be connected with the preceding: "I fear lest your minds be corrupted . . . for you bear finely with false preachers." But we see no good reason for departing from the older view, represented in the Vulg. and set forth above.

5. To connect with the preceding, something must be supplied, such as: But as it is, there is no reason for bearing with them, for I reckon, etc. Instead of "I have done nothing less than," better, as our version renders the same phrase in xii. 11: "I have no way come short of."

"The great apostles." Estius and many others take the reference to be to the leaders among the Twelve (Gal. ii. 9), by whose authority the false teachers at Corinth might have claimed to have been sent. But the majority of modern commentators take the words to refer ironically to the false apostles; and rightly, for it is they that are before St. Paul's mind in v. 4 and v. 6.

* "In dictione δ' ἡρώδης (2 Cor. xi. 4) Apostolus definite cogitaverit unum alterumque pseudo-doctorem nunc ad Corinthios sermones habentem; quare et usus ibi fuerit Verbis Praesentis Temporis, ἡρώδης et λαβόντες. Conferri illud potest epistolae ad Galatas (cap. v. 10) δ' οὐ τοῦτον ὅς τις βαρύνει τὸ κλημα, δοῦν δὲ ἡ."

magnis apostolis. * Nam etsi imperitus sermone, sed non scientia: in omnibus autem manifestati sumus vobis.

† Aut numquid peccatum feci, meipsum humilians, ut vos exaltemini? quoniam gratis evangelium Dei evan-

done nothing less than the great apostles. * For although I be rude in speech, yet not in knowledge: but in all things we have been made manifest to you.

† Or did I commit a fault, humbling myself, that you might be exalted? Because I preached unto you the gospel

The irony would be apparent if we rendered: "the more than great apostles," a rendering which is more in consonance with the meaning of ὑπερλίαν.

6. "But although (ἐὶ δὲ καὶ) I be rude in speech." There seems to be an implicit comparison with the false apostles, who probably expressed themselves with more ease and elegance in Greek. Jew that he was, St. Paul was probably more at home in Hebrew, and though he knew the Greek language well, as his Epistles abundantly testify, yet he may have lacked in *both* spoken and written word, and there is probably question of both here in τῷ λόγῳ, the ease and elegance of the native Greek scholar. Such, indeed, was the fixed opinion of St. Jerome, who understood him to admit here the comparative rudeness of his style. St. Augustine, however, took a different view, holding the sense to be: *supposing*, without admitting, that I am rude in speech, yet not in knowledge (cf. Estius).

The last clause, which may be rendered: "but in every respect (ἐν παντί) we were made manifest in all things (ἐν πᾶσι) to you" implies that he was more frank and candid than the false apostles in his dealings with the Corinthians. Instead of φανερωθέντες some authorities favour the singular φανερώθη; ("I was made manifest"); others, the participle of the aorist active, φανερώσαντες (we manifested it, i.e., the knowledge); whichever be the correct reading—and we cannot be certain—the general sense is that just indicated; and in the whole verse the Apostle, while confessing to a certain rudeness of style, implies that he was superior to his adversaries both in the knowledge of the doctrines he taught and in candour.

7. Substitute a comma for the note of interrogation after "exalted," and instead of "because" read rather "in that": Did I commit a fault . . . in that I preached unto you without expense to you? In "humbling myself" he alludes to the manual

gelizavi vobis ? * Alias ecclesias expoliavi, accipiens stipendium ad ministerium vestrum. * Et cum essem apud vos, et egerem, nulli onerosus fui nam quod mihi deerat, suppleverunt fratres qui venerunt a Macedonia : et in omnibus sine onere me vobis servavi, et servabo. ¹⁰ Est veritas Christi in me, quoniam haec gloriatio non

of God freely ? * I have taken from other churches, receiving wages of them for your ministry. * And, when I was present with you, and wanted, I was chargeable to no man : for that which was wanting to me, the brethren supplied who came from Macedonia : and in all things I have kept myself from being burthensome to you, and so I will keep myself. ¹⁰ The truth of Christ is in me, that this glorying shall

labour in which he had engaged at Corinth in order to support himself (cf. Acts xviii. 3).

8. Not only did he labour with his hands, but he also took from other churches in view of his mission to the Corinthians. The strong word *εσώλησα*—literally, "I robbed"—shows that the churches in question could ill afford what they gave, and that they were under no strict obligation to give it.

This verse alludes to the help received from the Macedonian churches in view of his mission to Corinth and before his arrival there, as the next refers to similar help received subsequently. It is naturally inferred from Acts xvii. 15 that the Macedonians paid his expenses as far as Athens, and they probably gave him money besides. By "your ministry" is meant "my ministry unto you."

9. "I was chargeable to no man." The Greek verb properly signifies "to be numb or torpid" and in a transitive sense "to make numb or torpid." Here, by what St. Jerome, *Ep. ad Algas.*, considered to be a provincialism in use in St. Paul's native province of Cilicia, it is used in the sense of being *burdensome*. "The brethren who came from Macedonia" may have been Silas and Timothy (cf. Acts xviii. 5); they supplied, in addition to (*προσενεπήρωσαν*) that which he could earn by his own manual labour, what was wanting for his support.

10. Here we have a promissory oath, or at least a solemn asseveration, that he would continue to preach the Gospel *gratis* in Achaia. Render : "As the truth of Christ is in me, this glorying shall not be stopped against me in the regions of Achaia." The metaphor in *ῥεγάσεται* is taken, according to St. Chrysostom, from interference with the course of a river. "Infringetur" of

infringetur in me in regionibus Achaiae. ¹¹ Quare ? Quia non diligo vos ? Deus scit. ¹² Quod autem facio, et faciam : ut amputem occasionem eorum qui volunt occasionem, ut in quo gloriantur, inveniantur

not be broken off in me in the regions of Achaia. ¹¹ Wherefore ? Because I love you not ? God knoweth it. ¹² But what I do, that I will do, that I may cut off the occasion from them that desire occasion, that wherein they glory, they may

the Vulg. may be understood in the same sense of "stopped" or "checked." The words "against me" are probably emphatic : whatever the false apostles might do, St. Paul would not allow his glorying on account of his *gratuitous* preaching of the Gospel to be stopped in the regions of Achaia.

11. After "God knoweth" (omitting "it") something is to be understood : God knoweth whether I love you, or God knoweth that that is not the reason. Probably St. Paul's adversaries suggested that the reason why he did not accept support from the Corinthians, was because he did not like them.

12. Some commentators hold that the false apostles were men of means and took nothing towards their support from the Corinthians, and understand the present verse to mean that St. Paul would continue to take nothing in order that he might cut off all occasion of their glorying against him ; in other words (the second clause introduced by *ἵνα* explaining the first) that in this matter whereof they boasted (of preaching gratuitously) they might be found to be no better than he and his companions. But v. 20 (cf. also 1 Cor. ix. 12) seems fatal to this view, for it implies clearly that the false apostles accepted and even exacted support from the Corinthians, a thing which is altogether likely *a priori*.

We take it that the false apostles accepted money from the Corinthians, and gloried in the fact as evidence that they were true apostles (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 7, 12), and that what St. Paul says is that he would continue to refuse to accept anything, in order that he might cut off the occasion (of being like him) from those who sought for an occasion of being found (*τῶν θελούντων ἀφορμὴν ἵνα εὐρεθῶσιν*) even as himself and his fellow-labourers in this matter (of accepting support) wherein the false apostles gloried. In other words, he would refuse to avail of his lawful claim to support, in order that the false apostles might not be able to say that they stood on an equal footing with him in this matter.

sicut et nos. ¹³ Nam eiusmodi pseudoapostoli sunt operarii subdoli, transfigurantes se in apostolos Christi. ¹⁴ Et non mirum: ipse enim Satanas transfiguratur se in angelum lucis. ¹⁵ Non est ergo magnum, si ministri eius transfigurentur velut ministri iustitiae: quorum finis erit secundum opera ipsorum.

¹⁶ Iterum dico (ne quis me putet insipientem esse, alioquin velut insipientem accipite me, ut et ego modicum quid glorier),

be found even as we. ¹³ For such false apostles are deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into the apostles of Christ. ¹⁴ And no wonder: for Satan himself transformeth himself into an angel of light. ¹⁵ Therefore it is no great thing if his ministers be transformed as the ministers of justice: whose end shall be according to their works.

¹⁶ Again I say (let no man think me to be foolish, otherwise take me as foolish, that I

13. Render: "For such men are false apostles, deceitful workmen, transforming themselves into apostles of Christ"; in the Vulg. put the comma after "sunt." They are called "deceitful," as pretending to a disinterestedness they did not really feel.

14. "Of light"; in allusion to the light of the Beatific Vision which the good angels enjoy (Matt. xviii. 10) and the radiance in which they appear to men (cf. Luke ii. 9; Matt. xxviii. 3, etc.).

15. As Satan sometimes puts on the appearance or assumes the rôle of a good angel, so the false apostles, his ministers, assume the rôle of genuine Apostles who by their ministry lead men to true justice. The last words of the verse imply that, however men may sometimes be deceived by their hypocrisy, God shall not be deceived, but their final fate (τὸ τέλος) shall be in accordance with their hypocritical works, for all must be manifested before the tribunal of Christ (v. 10).

16. "Again I say." What he says is contained, according to all the Fathers, in the remainder of the verse, so that the brackets are misleading. He looks back to v. 1, where he already craved their indulgence, which he now craves again. Here as there, the main idea is: listen to me, bear with me, while I say something in my own praise. Seeing, then, that the main idea is repeated, this is enough to explain the use of "again I say," and it is hardly necessary to show that the first clause here: "let no one think me to be foolish" is contained in anything that has preceded. But *de facto* the claim to knowledge in v. 6 was a claim that he was not foolish, while the folly alluded to in v. 1 is not

¹⁷ Quod loquor, non loquor secundum Deum, sed quasi in insipientia, in hac substantia gloriæ. ¹⁸ Quoniam multi gloriantur secundum carnem: et ego gloriabor. ¹⁹ Libenter enim suffertis insipientes: cum

also may glory a little). ¹⁷ That which I speak, I speak not according to God, but as it were in foolishness, in this matter of glorying. ¹⁸ Seeing that many glory according to the flesh, I will glory also. ¹⁹ For you gladly suffer the

really folly (cf. xii. 6), but only what might seem to be so. The whole verse may be rendered: "Again I say: let no one think me to be foolish; but if not (εἰ δὲ μή, *i.e.*, if you do not refrain from thinking me to be foolish), yet receive (or 'bear with') me as foolish, that I also (as well as the false apostles) may glory a little."

17. He admits that what he is about to say in this matter (or "confidence"; cf. on ix. 4) of glorying (for "gloriæ" of Vulg. read "gloriationis") is not said according to the general rule of Our Lord's teaching (κατὰ Κύριον) which condemns self-praise (Matt. vi. 2; Luke xvii. 10; xviii. 11-14), but is said as it were in foolishness. The "as it were" shows that there is not question of real foolishness, as does also xii. 6: "For though I should have a mind to glory, I shall not be foolish, for I will say the truth." What would ordinarily be foolish and opposed to the spirit and teaching of Christ, as the praise of one's self, may become necessary and laudable in special circumstances, as evidently St. Paul thought it necessary in order to bind the Corinthians to himself and guard them against the false teachers.

It is clear from this exposition of the verse that there is no ground here for the erroneous view that some portions of Scripture are not according to the Lord, *i.e.*, not inspired. St. Paul, who says in xiii. 3 that Christ speaketh in him, does not deny his own inspiration; but he explains that he is departing in this matter of glorying from the ordinary rule of conduct prescribed by Christ.

18. "According to the flesh," *i.e.*, as St. Chrysostom explains, "in external things; birth, wealth, learning, circumcision, Hebrew descent, reputation." We have an instance of such glorying in v. 22; see also Phil. iii. 4-5.

19. He does not anticipate that they will be offended by his glorying, for they gladly bear with the foolish, being themselves wise. The wise, or prudent are better able to make allowance

sitis ipsi sapientes. ²⁰ Sustinetis enim si quis vos in servitutum redigit, si quis devorat, si quis accipit, si quis extollitur, si quis in faciem vos caedit. ²¹ Secundum ignobilitatem dico, quasi nos infirmi fuerimus in hac parte.

In quo quis audet (in insipientia dico), audeo et ego :

foolish : whereas yourselves are wise. ²⁰ For you suffer if a man bring you into bondage, if a man devour you, if a man take from you, if a man be lifted up, if a man strike you on the face. ²¹ I speak according to dishonour, as if we had been weak in this part.

Wherein if any man dare (I speak foolishly) I dare also.

for the weakness and folly of others. But the words are severely ironical, for the next verse shows that the Apostle does not at all approve of the toleration extended to the false teachers.

20. He now charges them with submitting to the tyrannical exercise of authority by the false teachers, with allowing themselves to be lived upon and openly robbed (*κατεσθῆναι*) or circumvented by fraud and false pretences (*ἀκούβαναι*), with tolerating pride and haughtiness (*ὑπερπερῆναι*), and even contumely of the most extreme kind, such as is typified by a blow in the face (*εἰς πρόσωπον δέπειν*).

21. The first sentence is ironical. The sense seems to be : I speak despising myself, " with contempt of myself " (*κατὰ ἑαυτὸν* = *ἐν ἑαυτῷ*) as though we had been (as they allege) weak (" in this part " must be omitted, but it rightly completes the sense). He says ironically, then, that in comparison with the false teachers who trampled on and devoured the Corinthians, he is ashamed of himself and his companions. The *ὥς οὕτως*, as in 2 Thess. ii. 2, is used to imply that he does not agree in the fact stated, i.e., that he does not plead guilty to any real weakness, however his adversaries might accuse him of failing to maintain the dignity and exercise the rights of an Apostle (See Winer—Moult., *Gr.* 67, § 1 ; cf. J. H. Moulton, *Proleg.*, p. 212).

" Wherein if any man dare." The Greek : *ἐν ᾧ δ' ἂν τις τολμᾷ* means : " But whereinsoever any man is bold " or " dares " (to glory). It would have made for clearness if this had begun a new verse, for the Apostle now casts irony aside, and declares boldly that he has nothing to be ashamed of, because he is inferior in nothing to his adversaries. " The enumeration of his claims begins from those points in which his opponents were strongest, and from these gradually rises into a sphere where he leaves them behind, and ultimately loses sight of them altogether " (Stanley).

²² *Hebraei sunt, et ego : Israelitae sunt, et ego : semen Abrahae sunt, et ego :* ²³ *Ministri Christi sunt (ut minus sapiens dico), plus ego : in laboribus plurimis, in carceribus abundantius, in plagis supra modum, in mortibus*

²² *They are Hebrews : so am I. They are Israelites : so am I. They are the seed of Abraham : so am I. = They are the ministers of Christ : (I speak as one less wise,) I am more : in many more labours, in prisons more frequently, in stripes above*

22. The false apostles gloried in their Jewish origin ; but in this respect St. Paul was in no way inferior to them. In "Hebrews," "Israelites," "seed of Abraham," there is reference respectively to nationality, dignity as the chosen people of God, and inheritance of the Messianic promises. The Jews as a nation were distinguished from other nations by the name *Hebrews*.

This name is probably derived, not from Heber, one of Abraham's ancestors (Gen. xi. 15 ff.), but from a Hebrew word meaning *beyond* (עֲבָרָה), because Abraham the father of the race had come Westward to Canaan from *beyond* the Euphrates. See Gen. xiv. 13, where the name is first applied to Abraham, and where the LXX. renders it by ὁ παρών. In calling themselves "Israelites" the false teachers claimed to belong to God's chosen and privileged people (Rom. ix. 4), while in referring to themselves as the "seed of Abraham" they claimed to be of those who inherited the Messianic promises (Gal. iii. 16 ; Rom. ix. 5, 7, 8). Hence the present verse means : Do they claim to be Jews, to belong to God's chosen people, to be heirs to the Messianic promises ? I can make the very same claims. The verse shows that the adversaries were Jews.

23. Another claim of theirs was that they were ministers of Christ. The Apostle, without stopping to dispute the truth of the claim, says that he is such in a higher degree. The preposition ὡς is used adverbially : "multo majore gradu ego" (Grimm). In saying this, he accompanies it with another apology (cf. vv. 1, 17, 19) for his glorying : "I speak as one less wise," literally "as one mad, beside himself." He admits that his language may well seem altogether extravagant, but he will assert later on (xii. 11) that the circumstances required it.

He proceeds to prove his superior claims by his record of Apostolic labour and suffering. Taking the order of the clauses in the Vulgate, which is most probably correct, the Greek may be rendered : "in labours more abundantly, in prisons more

frequenter. ²⁴ A Iudæis quinquies, quadragenas, una minus, accepi. ²⁵ Ter virgis caesus sum, semel lapidatus sum, ter naufragium feci, nocte et die in profundo maris fui. ²⁶ In itineribus saepe, periculis fluminum periculis latronum, periculis ex genere, periculis ex gentibus, periculis in civitate, periculis in solitudine, periculis in mari,

measure, in deaths often. ²⁴ Of the Jews five times did I receive forty stripes, save one. ²⁵ Thrice was I beaten with rods, once I was stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck; a night and a day I was in the depth of the sea. ²⁶ In journeying often, in perils of water, in perils of robbers, in perils from my own nation, in perils from the gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the

frequently, in stripes above measure, in deaths (cf. i. 10) often." St. Luke in the Acts mentions only one imprisonment of the Apostle prior to the writing of this epistle (Acts xvi. 23).

24. In this and the next verse we have some instances of the stripes and dangers of death. The Jewish law (Deut. xxv. 3) restricted the number of stripes to forty, and for fear of exceeding the number, the Jews administered only thirty-nine, the number which the Apostle says here he received on five occasions. Thongs of leather were used to inflict the stripes, which were administered, thirteen on the bare breast and thirteen on each shoulder, while verses of the Law were read to the victim. We have no other record of these scourgings of the Apostle by the Jews.

25. The beating with rods, not scourges as in the case of our Divine Lord (Matt. xxvii. 16; John xix. 1), was inflicted by Gentiles. There was here no legal limit to the number of stripes. One of the three occasions, that at Philippi, is recorded by St. Luke (Acts xvi. 22). For the *stoning*, see Acts xiv. 18. Of the *shipwrecks* we have no other record, for that on the voyage to Rome (Acts xxvii) happened three years after this was written.

"A night and a day I was (παραίκα, 'I have passed,' as in Acts xx. 3) in the depth of the sea"; ἐν τῷ βυθῷ = "in the deep sea." We know nothing more of this incident. It is possible he was saved miraculously, but the probability is that he was clinging to a raft. At any rate, the presence of the article with βυθῷ makes it quite improbable that there is merely reference to a deep well or prison. The occasion is referred to separately from the other three shipwrecks as being much more terrible.

26. The general impression conveyed is that in his journeyings, whether by land or sea, he was confronted by dangers wherever

periculis in falsis fratribus :

²⁷ In labore et aerumna, in vigiliis multis, in fame et siti, in ieiuniis multis, in frigore et nuditate : ²⁸ Praeter illa quae extrinsecus sunt, instantia mea quotidiana, sollicitudo omnium

sea, in perils from false brethren : ²⁷ In labour and painfulness, in much watchings, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness, ²⁸ Besides those things which are without : my daily instance, the solicitude for all the

he turned : whether in the busy haunts of men, in the lonely desert or on the bosom of the deep. For "perils of waters" read "perils of rivers."

27. The "labour and painfulness" (rather "fatigue") were probably those sustained in earning his bread, that he might not be a burden to his converts (cf. 1 Thess. ii. 9 ; 2 Thess. iii. 8), for the labour incidental to travel has already been sufficiently implied in the preceding verse. Hence *voluntary* labour is meant, which might have been avoided by his accepting support from the churches (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 4, 7, 15, 18).

"In fastings often." Coming as this does immediately after the reference to the involuntary hunger and thirst incidental to his Apostolic life, it can mean nothing else than *voluntary* fasts undertaken to chastise his body (cf. 1 Cor. ix. 27).

28. "Besides those things which are without." The Greeks take this to mean : "besides the things which I omit," and begin a new sentence with what follows, in this manner : "Against me is the daily concourse (of enemies), mine is the care of all the churches." But it is much more probable that, as most commentators hold, the whole of v. 28 forms one sentence. Taking the Greek Fathers' meaning of τῶν ὑποκρῶς "things omitted" ("things that I leave unmentioned"), reading ἐπιτοῶς ("assiduous care," "anxiety"—the sense which was doubtless intended by the Vulg. "instantia," as appears from Judith iv. 9 ; Eph. vi. 18, the only other places where the Vulgate employs the word) with B K D E F G, etc., rather than ἐπιούτοῶς ("hostile concourse," or "onset"), and connecting the first clause of the verse with what follows, the sense seems to be : Besides the things left unmentioned, there is my daily anxiety, *namely*, the solicitude for all the churches. The last clause is thus in apposition to that preceding. Ἐπιτοῶς in the sense of *anxiety* is frequent in Polybius (cf. Grimm).

The Vulgate understands τῶν ὑποκρῶς of trials *from without*,

ecclesiarum. ²⁹ Quis infirmatur, et ego non infirmor? quis scandalizatur, et ego non uror? ³⁰ Si gloriari oportet: quae infirmitatis meae sunt, gloriabor.

churches. ²⁹ Who is weak, and I am not weak? Who is scandalized, and I am not on fire? ³⁰ If I must needs glory, I will glory of the things that concern

as opposed to the mental anxiety that follows here, and such scholars as Erasmus, Wetstein, Bengel agree with this view. As *παρατός* is not used in profane writers, and elsewhere in the New Testament only in Matt. v. 32; Acts xxvi. 29, it is hard to say if this sense is inadmissible; but it seems better to take the view of the Greek Fathers set forth above.

Instead of taking the last clause of the verse in apposition to that which precedes, as we do, Cornely, Bisping, etc., understand the "daily anxiety" in reference to the care which the Apostle bestowed on the private affairs of those who daily consulted him; and the last clause in reference to his solicitude for the public good of the churches.

It is hardly necessary to remark that St. Peter could have spoken in even a fuller sense of his care of all the churches, for St. Paul is speaking only of the Gentile churches which he had founded. "Peter, says Bengel, could not have said the same! A strange assertion indeed. Peter not anxious for all the churches! the 'rock' whereon Jesus Christ built His Church, whose special duty it was to *confirm the brethren* in the faith, to whose keeping was entrusted the entire fold, to *feed both lambs and sheep*" (McCarthy, *Epistles of the Sundays*, p. 118).

29. Here we have examples of what that Apostolic solicitude meant. The "weak" were those of weak or doubting conscience, in reference to whom he says in 1 Cor. ix. 22: "To the weak I became weak," i.e., he accommodated himself to their weak conscience (cf. 1 Cor. viii. 10, 13), and by heartfelt sympathy made their trials his own. There is reference to the same accommodation and sympathy here.

"Who is scandalized, etc." The sense is: "Who is led into sin by another's example, and I am not on fire with zeal (to win him back), and with holy indignation (against the scandal-giver)?" For the original sense of "scandal," see on 1 Cor. viii. 13.

30. We take it as certain that this and the next verse are not meant merely as an introduction to the two verses that follow, but were written chiefly in view of all that has been said from

³¹ Deus et Pater Domini nostri IESU CHRISTI, qui est benedictus in saecula, scit quod non my infirmity. ³¹ The God and Father of our Lord JESUS CHRIST, who is blessed for ever,

verse 23, and probably with reference also to what he is about to record in vv. 32-33. From verse 23 he has been showing that he has a higher claim than the false apostles to be regarded as a minister of Christ. It now occurs to him that the evidences which he has been adducing in support of that claim—his labours, his sufferings, his anxious cares—are, on the one hand, rather evidences of weakness than of strength and Apostolic power; on the other, that they are so numerous and of such a character as possibly to make it seem doubtful whether they could be crushed into a comparatively short space in one lifetime. To the first thought he alludes in the present verse; to the second in verse 31. The present verse means, therefore: If circumstances compel me, as they do, to boast, I will boast, *as I have just been doing*, of the things that are evidences of my weakness—(τὰ τῆς ἀσθενείας)—my sufferings and tribulations. Of course the Apostle had fully in mind (cf. xii. 9-10) that the marvellous success of his labours, well known to all, notwithstanding all these evidences of weakness, was the best proof that he was a true minister of Christ.

31. Here, to meet any doubt or question as to the truth of all he has said or is about to say, he swears by the Divine Father that he lies not. As the article is not repeated before πατὴρ we must understand the reference to be (cf. Beel., *Gr. Gr.*, p. 126 f.), not first to the Blessed Trinity and then to the Father, but only to the First Divine Person as God and Father of the Lord Jesus ("our," before "Lord" is to be omitted; and probably also "Christ" after "Jesus"). Christ on the cross cried out: "My God, My God"; and we need have no difficulty if the First Divine Person is spoken of as *the God* of the Lord Jesus, for as the source of Deity, from whom the Divine Son proceeds, He may be said to be such even in reference to Jesus as God, while of course the expression is easily understood in reference to Jesus as man.

"Who is blessed for evermore." This is to be referred, not to Jesus, but to the First Divine Person, the subject of the sentence. The idea is: I swear by Him, who is blessed for evermore, whose name God forbid I should invoke to confirm a lie.

mentior. ³² Damasci praepositus gentis Aretae regis custodiebat civitatem Damascenorum, knoweth that I lie not. ³² At Damascus the governor of the nation under Aretas the king,

32. One notable evidence of his weakness, and one that might appear particularly incredible, now occurs to his mind, and he adds it here, though it was already included in a general way in the risks of death alluded to in v. 23.

Damascus is one of the oldest cities of the world, old at least as the days of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 15). Josephus (Antiq. I., vi. 4) says it was founded by Uz, grandson of Shem. Situated at the Eastern foot of Anti-Libanus in a very beautiful and well watered plain, and on the high-road of commerce between Egypt and Upper Syria, as well as between Tyre and the far East, it has been an important city in almost every period of its chequered history. According to the latest statistics it has a population at present of 154,000 souls.

"The governor of the nation under Aretas the king," literally, "the ethnarch of Aretas the king." The ethnarch (from ἔθνος and ἄρχω) was a deputy governor, ruling a province in subjection to his sovereign. There is no reason to believe that the reference in the present case is merely to a Jewish prefect whose business it would be to regulate the affairs of the Jewish inhabitants of Damascus. Such a person would not be called the "ethnarch" of the Arabian king, nor would he have any authority to guard the city, as this governor did.

Aretas IV. was king of Arabia Nabataea, the capital of which was Petra. Josephus (Antiq. I., xii. 4) seems to say that this kingdom extended from the Euphrates to the Red Sea. But it is very difficult to say how Damascus came to be subject to the Arab king at the time to which St. Paul here refers, for from before the Christian era until 34 A.D. it belonged to the Roman province of Syria and was directly under Roman administration. This is proved by Damascene coins which bear the head of the Roman Emperor, and have no allusion to any local prince such as was usual in the coins of client states. Josephus says (Antiq. xviii. v.) that about the twentieth year of Tiberius (*ibid.*, xviii. 4, iv. 6), i.e., 33 A.D., Aretas and Herod Antipas the Tetrarch of Galilee quarrelled because the latter had determined to divorce the daughter of Aretas; that both raised armies and prepared for war, and that all the army of Antipas was destroyed. If, then, Aretas occupied Damascus as a result of this war, his

ut me comprehenderet : ²³ Et per fenestram in sporta dimissus sum per murum, et sic effugi manus eius.

guarded the city of the Damascenes to apprehend me : ²³ And through a window in a basket was I let down by the wall, and so escaped his hands.

ethnarch may have been there as early as 35 A.D. Others prefer to hold that Aretas did not occupy Damascus by force, but that it was freely granted to him by Caligula (37-41 A.D.) on the death of Tiberius in 37 A.D. The point is of importance in the chronology of St. Paul's life.*

33. The incident of Paul's escape, recorded here, is mentioned also by St. Luke (Acts ix. 23-25). The two narratives supplement each other, but there is no contradiction. St. Luke has no mention of the window, but he does not exclude it ; and if he says that the *Jews* guarded the city that they might *kill* Paul, while the Apostle himself tells us here that it was the *ethnarch* who guarded it that he might *apprehend* him, the accounts are plainly supplementary. The Jews could not have guarded a foreign city except by moving the local authorities to do so, and an Arabian governor would never have taken the trouble to do so, had he not been instigated by the Jews. The different intention of each party creates no difficulty, but has every appearance of probability.

The word for "basket" here, σποράνη (probably from a Hebrew root, meaning *to wreath, to twist*) means a basket of wicker-work or of twisted rope ; σπῦρίς (from a Greek root) used in Acts ix. 25 had the same meaning : "affine est voci σπείρα, igitur aliquid volutum, contortum seu complicatum" (Grimm).

St. Paul's example shows that it is sometimes lawful to fly from persecution (cf. Matt. ix. 23). It may be even obligatory to do so when God's greater glory or the greater good of the Church requires it.

* If Aretas had possession of Damascus as early as 35 A.D., Paul might have been converted as early as 32 or 33 A.D., for the escape in a basket referred to here and in Acts ix. occurred after his return from Arabia (cf. Gal. i. 17 ; Acts, ix. 23 : "and when many days were passed") and immediately before his going up to Jerusalem three years after his conversion (Gal. i. 18). On the other hand, if Aretas did not come into possession of Damascus before the death of Tiberius (37 A.D.), the earliest possible date for the conversion of Paul is 34 A.D., or if the three years be counted according to the ordinary Jewish method, both extremes being included, 35 A.D.

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

Glorying not expedient, but necessary in the circumstances (v. 1). Account of a marvellous vision accorded to him by God (2-4); he glories as the recipient of such a Divine favour; otherwise he will glory only in his infirmities (5), though he might justly glory in other things, but is content to be judged by his life and doctrine (6). A notable instance of his infirmity, permitted by God to suppress pride, and not removed at Paul's prayer that Christ's power might be the more clearly shown forth in the attainment of great ends through a weak instrument (7-9). Hence the Apostle takes pleasure in his infirmities, and in adverse circumstances (10). Renewed apology for glorying, and renewed defence of it in the circumstances (11). Appeal to the proofs of his apostleship given in Corinth, and to his past treatment of the Corinthian Church (12-13), from which in the future, as in the past, he will refuse to take support, being content to spend himself to promote their salvation (14-15). Refutation of a charge that he had fleeced them indirectly through his disciples (16-18). What he has written is not meant merely to please the Corinthians, but to promote their salvation, for he fears that when he shall come he may find them unworthy, and they may find him severe: that he may find among them evidences of schism, and still more that he may find much to mourn over in the matter of their impurity (19-21).

¹ Si gloriari oportet (non expedit quidem): veniam autem ad visiones et revelationes

¹ If I must glory (it is not expedient indeed): but I will come to the visions and re-

1. There is great variety of readings in this verse, but it is not of much importance. The best supported reading is: "I must needs glory (or, 'must I glory?'—καυχᾶσθαι δεῖ without or with the note of interrogation); it is not expedient indeed (μὲν) but I will come to visions, etc."

Another reading fairly supported is: "To glory indeed (καυχᾶσθαι δὲ) is not expedient for me (μοι), but I will come, etc."

A third reading is represented by the Vulgate: "If I must glory," etc.

Domini. ² Scio hominem in Christo ante annos quatuordecim (sive in corpore nescio, sive extra corpus nescio, Deus scit), raptum huiusmodi usque

velations of the Lord. ² I know a man in Christ above fourteen years ago, (whether in the body, I know not, or out of the body, I know not, God knoweth), such an one rapt even to the

The first reading is supported by most of the critics,* and also gives the best sense; we therefore adopt it without hesitation. Its opening words refer to the glorying that follows in reference to his visions, rather than to the Damascus incident. The sense is: "I must needs glory; it is not expedient indeed; but (since it is necessary) I will come to visions, etc."

Having shown in the preceding chapter his superiority over the false apostles by reason of the labours and perils he endured for the Gospel, he now shows that he excelled them also by reason of the marvellous favours conferred upon him by God.

Many distinguish "visions" from "revelations" in the sense that the things seen in visions were not understood, while in revelations they were. But since the Apostle seems to include both under the term "revelations" in v. 7, perhaps we may conclude that they are only different aspects of the same things—"visions" as seen by St. Paul, "revelations" as given by God.

2. He now proceeds to speak of one of these visions. The "man" is of course himself (cf. v. 7); and he refers to himself as "a man in Christ," i.e., a Christian man, incorporated in Christ by faith and Baptism.

"Above fourteen years ago." Omit "above," for the original means simply "fourteen years ago."

The Apostle's motive in mentioning the time may be, as St. Chrysostom suggests, to show that only necessity now forces him to refer to a matter which he had concealed so long. If this was written, as seems most probable, in 55 A.D., then fourteen years previously bring us back to 42 A.D., supposing St. Paul to follow the ordinary Jewish custom of counting the two extremes in his reckoning. This vision is, therefore, different from that in Acts xxii. 17-21, for the latter took place almost certainly on the occasion of the Apostle's first visit to Jerusalem three years after his conversion, and hence at least some years before the present vision. We have no data for saying *where* the present vision occurred.

* By Lachmann, Tisch., Treg., W. H. Brandscheid, etc.

ad tertium coelum. ³ Et scio huiusmodi hominem (sive in corpore, sive extra corpus, nescio, Deus scit), ⁴ Quoniam third heaven. ³ And I know such a man (whether in the body, or out of the body, I cannot tell: God knoweth): ⁴ That he was caught up into

As to *how* the vision took place, since the Apostle himself did not know, we cannot hope to know. Both body and soul may have been caught up to heaven, or the soul remaining in the body may have been enabled to exercise its activities in heaven (either mode might be referred to as "in the body"), or finally the soul may have quitted the body, leaving it dead for the time (and this would be "out of the body"). The Apostle insists upon his ignorance of the mode of the vision, probably in order to imply its sublimity. "God knoweth" implies that no man had the knowledge. It is worthy of note too that his language clearly implies that there was something in him that was incorporeal, something that was in fact the better part of him, since because of it he can speak of himself, even if the body was absent—in other words, he supposes his soul and its spirituality. Why precisely he speaks of "the third heaven" we cannot say. Doubtless the reference is to the abode of the blessed, but whether it is spoken of as *third* to distinguish it from our atmosphere as the first heaven and from the starry regions as the second, we do not know. Some prefer to think that a higher region, so to speak, in the abode of the blessed is meant, *i.e.*, that the first and second heaven were also in the abode of the blessed, but the former view seems more probable. First, then, there is the atmosphere of our earth which Sacred Scripture refers to as heaven in such expressions as "the clouds of heaven"; second there is the vast region of the stars often referred to as heaven in such expressions as "the stars of heaven"; and thirdly there is the abode of God and the blessed, referred to by Our Lord when He teaches us to say "Our Father, who art in heaven." Whether St. Paul saw God in *His essence*, as the blessed see Him, is also disputed. St. Augustine and St. Thomas (*Summa* I., qu. 12, a. 11 ad 2; II., 2 qu. 175, a. 5) affirm that he did; others deny, urging that no mortal man can see God (1 Tim. vi. 16; John i. 18, etc.).

4. Is there still question in verse 3 and here of the same vision as in v. 2? Most probably there is. For if the reference were now to a different vision, we should expect him to date it, as he

raptus est in paradisum ; et paradise ; and heard secret
 audivit arcana verba, quae non words, which it is not granted
 licet homini loqui. " Pro huius- to man to utter. " For such an

did that in v. 2 ; and besides if there be question here of a new vision, then he has told us nothing whatever of what he saw or heard in the former. Better, then, to say that there is still reference to the same occasion ; but the question still remains whether in the present verse and in v. 11 there is reference to two different experiences, two different stages, as it were in the same vision—" to the third heaven and thence to paradise," Clem. Alex. (*Strom.*, v. 12)—or only to one and the same thing under different aspects. The latter is the more common view (Aug., Amb., Thom., Caj., Est., Lap., etc.), and those who hold it say that Paradise is mentioned in addition to the third heaven to indicate the delights the Apostle experienced. The word Paradise, which occurs in New Testament only here and in Luke xxiii. 43, Apoc. ii. 7, is of Persian or Armenian origin (cf. Grimm ; Gesen. *Thes.* ii., p. 1124) and means a place of pleasure or delights. The LXX. applies the word to the Garden of Eden (Gen. ii. 15), and sometimes to any fertile and beautiful valley (Gen. xiii. 10).

" Secret words " ; ἀρρήτα ῥήματα might mean " words without speech " or " unspoken words," but probably it rather means " unspeakable words," and is explained by the clause that follows. It is clear that the Apostle does not mean to say that he heard with his bodily ears, for he has already said that he did not know whether he was in the body on the occasion ; there is question, then, of spiritual perception of heavenly things, " words " being used for " things " here as elsewhere, e.g., Luke ii. 15. " Dicit autem," says St. Thomas, "*audivit pro vidit, quia illa consideratio fuit secundum interiorem actum animae, in quo idem est auditus ac visus ; . . . dicitur autem consideratio illa visio, in quantum Deus videtur, et auditio, in quantum homo instruitur de divinis in ea.*"

" Which it is not granted to man to utter." The phrase is ambiguous in both the Greek and Latin ; it may mean : " which it is not lawful (or possible) to utter *to man*," or " which it is not lawful (or possible) *for a man* to utter." The latter is more probably the meaning ; God or an angel made them known to Paul, but they were " unspeakable " in the sense that man could not or ought not utter them.

5. Distinguishing, as it were, two persons in himself, one the

modi gloriabor : pro me autem nihil gloriabor nisi in infirmitatibus meis. * Nam, et si voluero gloriari, non ero insipiens : veritatem enim dicam : parco autem, ne quis me existimet supra id quod videt in me, aut aliquid audit ex me.

one I will glory ; but for myself I will glory nothing, but in my infirmities. * For though I should have a mind to glory, I shall not be foolish : for I will say the truth. But I forbear, lest any man should think of me above that which he seeth in me, or anything he heareth from me.

recipient of God's wondrous favours, the other Paul surrounded by infirmities, he will glory for the former, but for himself he will glory nothing, save in his infirmities—in those weaknesses, whether of body or mind, which serve to set forth the power of God who triumphs through him in spite of them (cf. vv. 9, 10).

6. Something seems to be suppressed, such as : Yet I could glory in other things besides my infirmities ; and the present verse proves the truth of this suppressed statement. The meaning is : *for* if I should desire to glory (in other things), I should not be foolish, since I should be speaking only the truth ; but I forbear to do it (τοῦ κωνχῶσθαι is understood after ἐπισθῆναι), lest anyone should think of me beyond what he seeth me to be or heareth from me ; in other words, he was satisfied to be judged by his life and teaching. This seems to be said of himself even when considered as distinct from the recipient of the glorious visions.

7. He now proceeds to mention a notable instance of his infirmity, at the same time making it clear that it was he himself who was caught up to Paradise. As the trial or affliction referred to was intended by God to check any temptation in the Apostle to pride, so it is probably mentioned here by him to ward off any suspicion of pride, and to show how weak he was, though so marvellously honoured by God.

Before ἵνα μή B K A F G read ὥς ("wherefore"), and this has led Lachmann and others to put verse 6 in a parenthesis, and connect the opening words of the present verse with the end of v. 5 : "but for myself I will glory nothing, save in my infirmities and in the exceeding greatness (τῇ ὑπερβολῇ) of the revelations," and begin the present verse with : "Wherefore that I might not be overmuch exalted." But such a view seems to us excluded, from the fact that it makes the Apostle, while distinguishing

⁷ Et ne magnitudo revelationum extollat me, datus est ⁷ And lest the greatness of the revelations should exalt me,

himself (v. 5) from the recipient of the revelations, yet glory *for himself* in the revelations. Better then with D E K L P and all the Versions omit *διό*, and understand: "and by reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations that I might not be too much exalted." The order of the words in the Greek throws the greatness of the revelations into special prominence.

"There was given me a sting of my flesh"—by God evidently, for Satan would not act for the purpose here indicated, namely, to keep down pride. The Greek for "a sting of my flesh"* is *σκόλον τῇ σαρκί*, which means literally "a thorn (or 'pointed stake') in the flesh." *Σκόλον* is always used in LXX. to mean a thorn (cf. Cornely), and doubtless it is in that sense, which would be familiar to St. Paul, that it is used here, but the meaning would be the same, if we understand of any sharp piece of wood. The idea, then, is that of a thorn or skewer adhering in the flesh and causing continuous pain, not of a goad (which would be *κέντρον*, Ecclus. xxxviii. 25; Acts ix. 5; xxvi. 14, etc.) inserted and withdrawn.

The Apostle further characterises this affliction as "an angel of Satan" read *σάτανᾱ*) or rather, as we believe, "a messenger of Satan." "Satan," as throughout the New Testament generally, is the personal name of the prince of devils; and St. Paul's affliction is said to be his messenger or instrument, probably because it was inflicted by Satan with God's permission, though for a different end from that intended by God, just as happened in the case of Job (Job ii. 7). We find it hard to see how a *personal* spirit subject to Satan can be meant, for the clause is apparently in antithesis to the preceding: "a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan." And if material things like the winds are spoken of as the messengers of God (Ps. 103-4), there is no reason why a temporal affliction may not be referred to as a messenger of Satan.

Finally, the Apostle says that this messenger of Satan was given "to buffet" him, and he uses not the aorist subj. *κολάσῃ*, which would imply merely *transient* action, but the pres. subj., implying continued action and punishment. The Greek verb means primarily "to strike with the fist," then in a more general

* R. V.: "a thorn (marg. 'stake') in the flesh."

mihi stimulus carnis mee there was given me a sting of
angelus Satanæ, qui me cola- my flesh, an angel of Satan to

sense to treat with contumely or violence, to subject to punishment. In its primary sense the verb would require us to understand the "messenger of Satan" of a *personal* agent, but the primary sense is not meant here, any more than in 1 Cor. iv. 11; 1 Pet. ii. 20, the only other passages where it occurs in New Testament, and the secondary sense, of subjecting to pain or suffering, requires only an impersonal agent directed by the Devil with God's permission. After "to buffet me" many authorities repeat the words: "that I might not be too much exalted," and though they are wanting in many other equally good authorities it is possible that the Apostle repeated them to throw into greater prominence God's motive in permitting the affliction, and that they were thought by some scribe to be superfluous and so omitted.

And now we are in a position to inquire, what is this "thorn in the flesh," this "messenger of Satan?" Probably the Corinthians recognised it at once by this metaphorical description, but from an early period opinion has been divided on the point. The common opinion among Catholics in later times, almost universally adopted indeed by our ascetical writers, is that there is question of temptation against purity, and this view is held by many great commentators, and suggested not only by the Rheims version, but also by the Latin Vulgate, "*stimulus*" being a *good* or *sting*. But this view is taken by no Greek Father, nor is there any *clear* support for it in any Latin Father until the end of the fifth century (cf. Cornely). Moreover, the intrinsic arguments against it are very strong. 1. The "thorn in the flesh" points to something permanent and abiding, not occasional and transitory, as temptations against purity would be, we may suppose, even in the case of St. Paul. 2. The Apostle seems to speak of something extraordinary and peculiar, not of temptations experienced by all humanity. 3. He would not be likely to say that he *gloried* (v. 9) and *took pleasure* (v. 10) in such an infirmity as carnal temptation. 4. It is improbable that he would speak of his secret and unknown temptations in a passage directed against adversaries, and thus supply them with a new handle for attacking him.

Some modern commentators have suggested that there is question of the remorse felt by the Apostle for his early life

phizet. * Propter quod ter buffet me. * For which thing thrice I besought the Lord, that Dominum rogavi ut discederet it might depart from me :

before his conversion, when he persecuted Christians. But though the memory of that early period served no doubt to humble him (1 Cor. xv. 9), yet such remorse would hardly be said to be "given" to him; and as he knew that God had had mercy on him and pardoned him because he "did it ignorantly in unbelief" (1 Tim. i. 13), such a memory could hardly be referred to as "a thorn in the flesh."

The Greek Fathers commonly understood the reference to be to St. Paul's adversaries or to the persecutions and sufferings caused by them. But it is evident that such a view is a very unnatural understanding of the metaphor "a thorn in the flesh," nor is it likely that St. Paul who knew that persecution was the lot of all the Apostles (1 Cor. iv. 9 ff.) would pray to be freed from it altogether, as he did (v. 9).

Finally there is the view that "the thorn in the flesh," the "messenger of Satan" is some bodily ailment—what we cannot say, but the Corinthians probably knew. Severe and ceaseless head-ache, serious affection of the eyes or ears, paralytic affection which distorted his countenance, and would be likely to provoke ridicule and impede his work as an Apostle, have all been suggested, with many more. At any rate some chronic malady would be fitly suggested by "a thorn in the flesh," and if the Apostle regarded it as brought upon him by the devil with God's permission, he could aptly refer to it as "a messenger of Satan, to cause him pain." This view is held by St. Basil the Great and St. Greg. Naz., by St. Aug. on Ps. cxxx. 7 ("dolore quodam corporis"), though at other times he doubted, as in *De Nat. et Grat.* 27, 31 ("nescio quem stimulum carnis"), by St. Thomas and Cajetan and among modern commentators by Maier, Cornely, etc.

8. The sense is : "In reference to which messenger (of Satan) thrice I besought the Lord that it might depart from me." "Thrice" is thought by some to be put for an indefinite number; but there is no reason why we may not take it that the Divine response came after he had asked just three times.—"That it might depart from me." Even if the verb ἀνέστη imply *personal* action, its use here is explained by the fact that the malady has already been personified as "a messenger of Satan."

a me : * Et dixit mihi : Sufficit tibi gratia mea : nam virtus in infirmitate perficitur. Libenter igitur gloriabor in infirmitatibus meis, ut inhabitet in me virtus Christi. ¹⁰ Propter quod placeo mihi in infirmitatibus meis, in

* And He said to me : My grace is sufficient for thee : for power is made perfect in infirmity. Gladly therefore will I glory in my infirmities, that the power of Christ may dwell in me. ¹⁰ For which cause I please

9. " And He said (Gr. ' hath said ') to me." Christ is meant, as the end of this verse proves. The perf. " hath said " seems to point to *repeated* assurances given by Christ—how precisely we cannot say. The Apostle's prayer was not heard in the way he desired ; he wished the affliction removed ; Christ implies that it shall remain, but implicitly promises internal supernatural aid, *gratia adjuvans*, through which he may triumph over and merit by it. " The Lord is good, who often does not give what we desire, that He may give what we would prefer " (St. Jer., Ep. ad Paulin).

" For power (some authorities read ' my power ') is made perfect, etc." The sense often given to these words, that *virtue* is made perfect in trials, is not what is meant. " Virtus " of the Vulg. is not " virtue," but " power," as is evident from the Greek (δύναμις). The words are Christ's ; and even if " my " be omitted before " power "—as it probably must be, the weight of evidence being against it—the power is Christ's, as the reference in the end of the verse to " the power of Christ " proves. The meaning is that Christ's power, or Divine power is best shown forth in its perfection when it uses weak instruments. If St. Paul's malady seemed to unfit him for his office, the triumph of Christ's grace in and through him would be all the greater (cf. iv. 7).

" Gladly therefore, etc." The Greek is more expressive : " *Most* gladly therefore will I *rather* glory in " (than ask to be relieved from) " my infirmities."—" Dwell in me," or " make its abode with me," the idea being that the Apostle's chronic affliction would lead to the *continuous* manifestation of Divine power in him.

10. Hence he declares that he *takes pleasure* in infirmities, etc., because he has learned from experience that when he is *naturally* weak, then *by Divine aid* he is really strong. Some take the four substantives that follow as explaining " infirmities," but " infirmities " rather refers to the weaknesses in himself, especially the bodily ailment (v. 7), the others to external circumstances.

contumeliis, in necessitatibus, in persecutionibus, in angustiis pro Christo: cum enim infirmor, tunc potens sum.

¹¹ Factus sum insipiens, vos me coegistis. Ego enim a vobis debui commendari: nihil enim minus fui ab iis qui sunt supra modum apostoli: tametsi nihil sum: ¹² Signa tamen apostolatus mei facta sunt super

myself in my infirmities, in reproaches, in necessities, in persecutions, in distresses, for Christ. For when I am weak, then am I powerful.

¹¹ I am become foolish: you have compelled me. For I ought to have been commended by you: for I have no way come short of them that are above measure apostles: although I be nothing. ¹² Yet the signs of my apostleship

11. Looking back on all he has said from xi. 1, he says: "I am become foolish." He does not really mean to admit folly (cf. v. 6; xi. 16), but only that his glorying looks like folly. Hence he at once defends himself by adding that they had compelled him to it and so justified it, for whereas they ought to have repelled the calumnies of his adversaries they had left the task to himself.

"I have no way come short of them that are above measure apostles." See above on xi. 5, where the Greek is substantially the same.

"Though I be (or 'am') nothing," i.e., left to himself, and apart from the grace of God. The Clem. Vulgate, following the Greek Fathers, connects these words with the following verse: "Though I am nothing, yet the signs, etc.," but the connection with what precedes seems on the whole more probable.

12. "Yet the signs of my apostleship." This is a literal rendering of the Vulg.: "signa tamen apostolatus mei," but the best Greek reading is τὰ μὲν σημεῖα τοῦ ἀποστόλου, "truly the signs of the (true) apostle, etc."—"All patience" is endurance of every kind of trial that befell. It is disputed whether it is here set down as the first of the signs of the true Apostle or only to imply the trying external circumstances calling for patience, amid which those signs were wrought. In the former case the Apostle appeals to two notes: his great patience (cf. Luke xxi. 19), and his miracles; in the latter, only to his miracles performed amid trying circumstances.—"Signs, wonders and mighty deeds" are different names for the same miracles viewed under different aspects: "signs" as evidences of the truth of the doctrine which they were wrought to confirm; "wonders" as being beyond the

vos, in omni patientia, in signis, et prodigiis, et virtutibus. ¹² Quid est enim, quod minus habuistis prae ceteris ecclesiis, nisi quod ego ipse non gravavi vos? Donate mihi hanc iniuriam. ¹⁴ Ecce tertio hoc paratus sum venire ad vos: et non ero gravis vobis. Non enim quaero quae vestra sunt, sed vos. Nec enim debent filii parentibus thesaurizare sed

have been wrought on you, in all patience, in signs, and wonders, and mighty deeds. ¹² For what is there that you have had less than the other churches; but that I myself was not burthensome to you? Pardon me this injury. ¹⁴ Behold, now the third time I am ready to come to you; and I will not be burthensome unto you. For I seek not the things that are yours, but you. For neither ought the children to lay up for the parents, but the

ordinary course of nature and so exciting wonder and admiration; "mighty deeds" or "powers" (δυνάμεις) as supposing and manifesting Divine power.*

13. Another reason why he ought to have been commended by the Corinthians is that in no way had they been *made inferior* by him to the rest of the churches, except, as he adds ironically, that he himself had not been burthensome to them by taking his support from them. This had probably been urged by his adversaries as proving his want of affection for the Corinthian Christians (cf. xi. 11). The absurd charge needed no refutation, so he adds in irony and sarcasm: "pardon me this injury" (done to you).

14. Here he tells them that he will continue to accept nothing from them, making it evident that the last clause of v. 13 is ironical. He seeks not their goods but themselves, and this he implies was only fitting, for he was their spiritual father (cf. 1 Cor. iv. 15), and parents are bound to provide for their children, not children for their parents. This is the natural order of things; but though children are not bound to *lay up* for their parents, they are bound to assist them in need.

The opening words of the verse raise the question whether the Apostle had visited Corinth twice before this was written, or only once, the second visit which he was *ready to pay* (cf. i. 15-17) not having been actually paid. In the light of ii. 1; xiii. 1 we have no doubt that he had already paid two visits. St. Luke in

* This is summed up briefly and neatly by Cornely: "Primo igitur nomine finis, altero natura, tertio causa miraculorum indicari videntur."

parentes filiis. ¹⁵ Ego autem libentissime impendam, et superimpendar ipse pro animabus vestris : licet plus vos diligens, minus diligar.

¹⁶ Sed esto : ego vos non gravavi : sed cum essem astutus, dolo vos cepi. ¹⁷ Numquid per aliquem eorum quos misi ad vos, circumveni vos ? ¹⁸ Rogavi Titum, et misi cum

parents for the children. ¹⁵ But I most gladly will spend and be spent myself for your souls : although, loving you more, I be loved less. ¹⁶ But be it so : I did not burthen you : but being crafty, I caught you by guile. ¹⁷ Did I overreach you by any of them whom I sent to you ? ¹⁸ I desired Titus, and I sent with him a brother.

Acts makes no mention of the second visit, but his silence is no argument against it any more than against the Apostle's visit to Arabia (cf. Acts ix. 20-26 ; Gal. i. 17). See Introd. ii. 1 (a).

15. The sense is : But I will gladly spend whatever is mine—time, health, strength, nay my very life for your souls ; ἐκστρ. implies utter exhaustion.

The last words of the verse : " although loving you more, I be loved less," as Theodosius remarks, are both accusatory and conciliatory, charging them with want of affection for him, yet intimating his abundant affection for them. The R.V. takes this clause as independent and complete in itself : " If I love you more abundantly, am I loved the less ? "

16. " But be it so " is a concession taken up from the mouths of his adversaries ; the rest of the verse is also his statement of a charge of theirs against him, to the effect that he had craftily fleeced the Corinthians through his legates ; " ὑπαρχων here, as in viii. 17 ; 1 Cor. xi. 7, expresses the habitual state or condition of the person, and is therefore equivalent to the Latin *quippe qui essem*, ' inasmuch as I was ' " (Stanley). The note of interrogation at the end of this verse in some editions of the Vulgate, is most probably a mistake.

17. Our version gives the sense correctly. In the original τίνα has nothing to govern it ; in his indignation at the charge the Apostle mixes two constructions : " Did I ask any of those whom I have sent to you to take advantage of you ? " and : " Did I take advantage of you *through* any of those whom I have sent ? "

18. The reference is to a preceding visit of Titus to Corinth implied in vii. 6-7 ; 14-15 ; viii. 6. Who " *the* brother " was we do not know, but of course the Corinthians knew well. This visit must be carefully distinguished from another which was still *future* when this letter was written, and which is alluded to, as

illo fratrem. Numquid Titus vos circumvenit? nonne eodem spiritu ambulavimus? nonne iisdem vestigiis?

19 Olim putatis quod excusamus nos apud vos? Coram Deo in Christo loquimur: omnia autem charissimi propter aedificationem vestram. 20 Timeo enim, ne forte cum

Did Titus overreach you? Did we not walk with the same spirit? did we not in the same steps?

19 Of old, think you that we excuse ourselves to you? We speak before God in Christ: but all things (my dearly beloved) for your edification.

20 For I fear lest perhaps when

we have seen, in viii. 6, 18, etc. The last two clauses of the verse imply that in *spirit* and in *outward conduct* the Apostle and the disciple were one.

19. Here he points out the purpose of this polemical section (x. 1 ff.) or perhaps of the whole Epistle. It was not that he might excuse himself to the Corinthians, but that he might bring about their amendment and building up in God, that so he might not be forced to deal severely when he came among them.

Instead of πάλιν ("of old"), a less probable reading is πάλιν ("again"). As πάλιν has the support of B E A F G, etc., and as there is not a word in the epistle up to this point signifying that the Corinthians had thought the Apostle was excusing himself, as would be implied if "again" were genuine here, we adopt the reading "of old." The clause may be taken affirmatively or interrogatively, and the meaning is: "You are *long since* thinking that we excuse ourselves to you," or "Are you long since thinking? etc." The following clause: "we speak before God in Christ" is regarded by many as containing two oaths, one by God, the other by Christ (cf. Gal. i. 20; Rom. ix. 1), but an oath was hardly to be expected here, and besides τὰ δὲ πάντα, "but all things" would be a very unnatural way of introducing what was sworn. Better then to take this clause with the next as stating his real object in writing as he has done. It was with God in view ("before God," and not looking merely to the judgment of men), and as a member of Christ or in the Spirit of Christ that he has written; and all that he has said, has been meant not to excuse himself, but to promote the building up of the Corinthians in faith and grace. Note the tender "dearly beloved," used only once elsewhere in the entire Epistle (vii. 1), and meant here to soften the severe things he is about to say.

20. Here he explains the reason of his anxiety for their building up, or edification. It is that he is afraid that when he comes he

venero, non quales volo, inveniam vos ; et ego inveniar a vobis, qualem non vultis : ne forte contentiones, aemulationes, animositates, dissensiones, detractioes, susurrationes, inflationes, seditiones, sint inter vos : ²¹Ne iterum, cum venero, humiliet me Deus

I come, I shall not find you such as I would, and that I shall be found by you such as you would not. Lest perhaps contentions, envyings, detractions, whisperings, swellings, seditions, be among you. ²¹Lest again, when I come God humble me among you :

may find them not such as he would, and that he himself may be found by them such as they would not.

"Lest perhaps contentions, etc." The first four words occur in the same order in Gal. v. 20, where the Vulg. renders the second pair "*irae, rixae.*" They refer to evidences of schism and rivalry about teachers (1 Cor. i. 11 ; iii. 3) which he fears he may still find existing among them, together with *open* and *secret* attacks ("detractions, whisperings") on the good name of opponents, and "swellings" of pride and jealous rivalry (1 Cor. iv. 6, 18), and "seditions," or disturbances affecting the peace and order of the Christian community. The last words : "be among you" are wanting in the Greek, in which εὑρεθῶσιν, suggested by the preceding εὑρεθῶ, was meant to be supplied : "lest perhaps *there be found* contentions, etc."

21. Besides the evils connected with the schism, he fears still more that he may find much to mourn over in the matter of impurity, for which, as we know, Corinth was notorious. His greater fear on this score is implied by the change from μήπω (lest perhaps) v. 20 to the simple μή ("lest") here.

We connect "again" with "humble me," not with "I come" (cf. *Intro.* ii., 1 ; xiii. 1) : "lest, when I come (Gen. Aba.), my God may again humble me among you" ; and we understand the Apostle to imply that his second visit, of which St. Luke has left us no record in the Acts, was a sorrowful one. For "God" read "*my God,*" which is more emphatic and more ardent. He fears that he shall be humbled at the sight of many who have failed to profit by his apostolic labours, and may have to mourn over many "who have sinned *before*"—probably after their conversion, but before his second visit or before he wrote the preceding letter, our present First Epistle, in which he set forth clearly the malice of such sins (1 Cor. vi. 13 ff.), not before their conversion—"and did not do penance for the uncleanness, etc."

apud vos ; et lugeam multos ex
iis qui ante peccaverunt, et non
egerunt poenitentiam super im-
munditia, et fornicatione, et
impudicitia, quam gesserunt.

and I mourn many of them that
sinned before, and have not
done penance for the uncleanness
and fornication and lasciviousness,
that they have committed.

St. Paul's fear seems to be that those sinners who had not done penance after his former letter, may still fail to do it even after the present letter, and that he may have to proceed against them when he comes to Corinth. He does not charge them with continuing to commit those sins, but only with not having done penance for the past, from which we may infer, as Estius points out, that mere amendment of life is not enough.

The words "uncleanness and fornication and lasciviousness" are most probably intended to cover all kinds of sin against purity, for the reference to all kinds is natural here. The same three words are found together in Gal. v. 19, but in a different order, "fornication" coming first ; and there too they seem to cover all kinds of sin against purity, for πορνεία (adultery) and in the Latin text "luxuria," are to be omitted there according to the best authorities.*

* The distinction suggested between the words by Cornely : " Porro tria libidinis nomina ita distingui possunt ut primum (*ἀκαθαρσία* immunditia) sit generale omnesque libidinis species complectatur, alteram (*πορνεία* fornicatio) illam speciem designet, quae Corinthi communior erat, tertium demum (*ἀσέλγεια* impudicitia) graviora peccata significet," must be rejected, in view of the order of the words in Gal. v. 19, where *ἀκαθαρσία* comes only in the second place. More probable is Estius' view that "fornication" covers all sexual connection outside marriage, "uncleanness" all *unnatural* sins of the flesh, and "lasciviousness" immodest kisses, touches, etc.

CHAPTER XIII

OUTLINE OF ARGUMENT

At his third visit he will come as a strict and severe judge, and since they seem to want proof of his authority, which is the mighty authority of Christ, he will give it to them if necessary (vv. 1-4). Hence he warns them to prove themselves beforehand, for if they fail in their duty, he trusts that he shall not fail in his (5-6). But the prayer of himself and his companions is that the Corinthian Christians may be found by them strong in virtue, and that they may have no need to show their authority (7-9), and with this end in view the present letter was written (10). Closing exhortation, salutation, and most solemn benediction (11-13).

¹ ECCE tertio hoc venio ad vos : In ore duorum vel trium testium stabit omne verbum. ¹ BEHOLD, this is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three

1. In xii. 20 the Apostle referred to a twofold fear he had : one that he might not find the Corinthians such as he would wish, the other that he might not be found by them such as they would wish. The first point he developed in xii. 20, 21, and he now proceeds to develop the second.

"Behold" is probably not genuine.—"This is the third time, etc." The plain meaning of these words implies that the Apostle had already visited Corinth twice, and to say that the second visit was merely intended is altogether unnatural. See above on ii. 1 ; xii. 14 ; Introd. ii., 1 (α).—The remainder of the verse is a quotation from Deut. xix. 15, where the Mosaic Law lays down that in judicial proceedings the evidence of one witness against a person accused of a crime was not enough, but at least two or, if convenient, three witnesses should agree against him. The text is quoted substantially from the LXX., which does not really differ from the Hebrew. The Hebrew indeed speaks of two or three witnesses, while the LXX., followed by St. Paul here (δύο μαρτύρων καὶ τριῶν), seems to speak of two and three, but "and" here has the sense of even, so that the meaning is that the crime was to be proved by the testimony of two, even of three, witnesses, where so many could be had conveniently. In recalling this provision

² Praedixi, et praedico, ut witnesses shall every word
 praesens, et nunc absens, iis qui stand. ² I have told before,
 ante peccaverunt, et ceteris and foretell, as present and
 omnibus, quoniam si venero now absent, to them that
 sinned before and to all the
 rest, that if I come again, I

of the Law here, St. Paul indicates that he intends to proceed against the Corinthian sinners in strictly judicial form, and at the same time implies that it is with *public* sins he will deal, which can be adequately proven.

Many good authorities have held that the witnesses meant by the Apostle are his visits to Corinth, each visit being regarded as a witness against the sinners, because they did not take advantage of the Apostle's preaching and the graces with which God accompanied it, to amend. But this is highly artificial, and there is really no good reason for departing from the obvious and quite satisfactory view that he speaks of personal witnesses.

2. "As present and now absent." It is certain that "the second time" (τὸ δεύτερον) must be inserted after "as present," and the meaning is: I have told before, and I foretell, as when present the second time, so (οὕτως being understood*) now when I am absent, etc. What he foretold to those who had sinned before his second visit, and now foretells to all similar sinners, is that if he come again he will no longer leave them unpunished, but will deal with them according to rigorous justice.

Those who hold that the Apostle had paid only one visit to Corinth before this time, commonly understand him to mean that he had said before in our First Epistle (iv. 19-21), and that he now says again in this present passage as if he were present for the second time, *although* he is absent, to those who sinned before he wrote the First Epistle and to all similar sinners, that if he come again he will not spare (cf. Stanley). But the meaning of "although" thus given to καὶ before ἔτι is most unnatural here, where it seems merely to connect the two participles παρών and ἔτι as a simple copulative; moreover, this view may be dismissed, seeing that the Apostle had already paid two visits to Corinth (cf. ii. 1; xii. 14; xiii. 1; Introd. ii. 1 (a)).

* "Nonnunquam in altero enuntiati membro vocula demonstrativa (οὕτως seu alia similis) omittitur et cogitando addenda est, ut Matt. viii. 13; Col. ii. 6; Lc. vi. 10, etc.; referendus huc est etiam, 2 Cor. xiii. 2; ut secunda vice praesens ita etiam nunc absens" (Grimm on ἔτι, 1).

iterum, non parcam. ³ An experimentum quaseritis eius qui in me loquitur Christus, qui in vobis non infirmatur, sed potens est in vobis? ⁴ Nam etsi crucifixus est ex infirmitate: sed

will not spare. ³ Do you seek a proof of Christ that speaketh in me, who towards you is not weak, but is mighty in you? ⁴ For although He was crucified through weakness; yet he

3. Instead of "do you seek a proof," we must read "*seeing that* (ἐπει) you seek a proof"; and this is probably to be connected closely with the preceding: I will not spare, but will give you proof, seeing that you seek it, of Christ speaking in me, and that what I say about punishing the impenitent I say with His authority. The remaining words of the verse show how serious a thing it would be to provoke him and put him to the test of showing his authority by punishing them. For Christ, by whose authority he will proceed, is not weak in their regard or against them (ἐς ὑμᾶς), but mighty among them—manifesting His power not only by the miracles wrought by His ministers (xii. 12), but also by punishments (1 Cor. xi. 30).

Some prefer to begin a new sentence with v. 3, and to connect it with v. 5 thus: "Seeing that you seek a proof of Christ speaking in me, . . . try your own selves," and they regard the intervening words as parenthetic. "But though this method yields good sense, it seems too artificial and far-fetched; nor is the Apostle accustomed so accurately to complete a sentence, interrupted by so long a parenthesis" (Bloomf.). On the whole, the connection indicated above seems more natural.

4. He proves that Christ was mighty among them. It is uncertain whether *et* is to be read. If read, the sense would be: "For although He was crucified, etc." If *et* be omitted, the sense is practically the same: "For indeed He was crucified, etc."

"Through weakness," i.e., if the passible human nature which He had assumed, made His crucifixion and death possible, *et* being used here (as Grimm points out), "*de eo ex quo aliquid consequitur.*" He was crucified in His passible human nature, but He lives now a glorious and immortal life as a result of the power of God which raised Him from the dead.

"For we also are weak in Him; but we shall live with Him, etc." The simplest view of the connection of this clause seems to be that it enforces the truth of the statement that Christ liveth by the power of God, or rather that it gives a new argument for the truth of the statement in the end of v. 3, namely, that Christ

vivit ex virtute Dei. Nam et nos infirmi sumus in illo : sed vivemus cum eo ex virtute Dei in vobis.

* Vosmetipsos tentate si estis in fide : ipsi vos probate. An non cognoscitis vosmetipsos, quia CHRISTUS IESUS in vobis

liveth by the power of God. For we also are weak in Him ; but we shall live with Him by the power of God towards you.

* Try your own selves if you be in the faith : prove ye yourselves. Know you not your own selves, that CHRIST JESUS

was mighty among the Corinthians. The immortal life of Christ is suggested and in a manner proved by the fact that His ministers, Paul and his companions, weak though they are in fellowship with Christ who was weak (*ἐν αὐτῷ*), shall yet now by the power of God in fellowship with Him in His risen might, manifest vigorous life and power against the Corinthians. For "in vobis" of Vulg. read "in vos."

5. Here he bids them, instead of seeking to prove him (v. 3), to try and to prove their own selves whether they are in the faith ; in which case they shall need and shall receive no proof of his authority. The faith in question was not a faith that wrought miracles (1 Cor. xii. 9), for the possession of such a faith would be no certain proof that Christ was in them or even among them ; and for the same reason it was not merely a dead faith, but a living faith enlivened by charity (Gal. v. 6). It is true, we cannot be certain with a certainty of faith that we are in the state of grace, "cum nullus scire valeat certitudine fidei, cui non potest subesse falsum, se gratiam Dei esse consecutum" (Trent, Sess. vi., cap. 9), but we can have moral certainty and so could the Corinthians, and it is in order that they might attain this that the Apostle tells them to try themselves and prove themselves. Proving is not quite the same as trying in the case ; it suggests that they will come happily out of the trial.

The remainder of the verse asks : "Or (*ἢ*) know you not that Christ Jesus is in you, unless indeed you be reprobate ?" He seems to imply that this knowledge regarding themselves ought to convince them that he, their Apostle, speaks with the authority of Christ (v. 3). But while he hopes that they have this moral certainty that they are in the state of grace and that Jesus Christ dwells in them, the last words of the verse, "unless indeed you be reprobate," imply doubt in regard to some. "Reprobate" (*ἀδόκιμοι*) are here those who might be unable to bear the proof

est ? nisi forte reprobi estis. ⁶ Spero autem quod cognoscetis, quia nos non sumus reprobi. ⁷ Oramus autem Deum ut nihil mali faciatis, non ut nos probati appareamus, sed ut vos quod bonum est faciatis : nos autem ut reprobi simus. ⁸ Non enim possumus aliquid adversus veritatem, sed pro veritate. ⁹ Gaudemus enim, quoniam nos infirmi sumus, vos autem potentes estis. Hoc et oramus vestram consummationem.

is in you, unless perhaps you be reprobates ? ⁶ But I trust that you shall know that we are not reprobates. ⁷ Now we pray God that you may do no evil, not that we may appear approved, but that you may do that which is good, and that we may be as reprobates. ⁸ For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth. ⁹ For we rejoice that we are weak, and you are strong. This also we pray for, your perfection.

(δοκιμή) before referred to, people destitute of a living faith. Hence there is no question whatever in the verse of the reprobation of the unpredestined.

6. Here he tells them that whether or not they come well out of *their* trial, at any rate he hopes to come well out of *his*, and if they put him to the proof they shall learn that he and his companions speak and act with the authority of Christ.

7. Yet they hope, he and Timothy, etc. (read the plural εὐχόμεθα) that it may not be necessary for them to show their authority, but rather that they may appear among the Corinthians as if they lacked it. The sense of the whole verse is : but we pray God that you do no evil ; we *do not pray* that we may appear having authority, but that you may do what is good, and that we may appear as if we lacked authority, not being called upon to exercise it.

8. " Truth " here is moral righteousness, the practical truth of good works (cf. John iii. 21). This verse helps to throw light upon the meaning of the preceding.

9. Read : " For we rejoice *when* (ὅταν) we are weak, and you are strong." Paul and his companions rejoiced, when through not being forced to exercise it they might seem to be weak and devoid of authority, and when the Corinthians were strong in faith and virtue, so that no coercive measures needed to be taken against them. He adds that he and his companions not only rejoiced at such a condition of the Corinthians, but even prayed for their perfection. " Your perfection " is in apposition to " this," as our version implies, and there seems to be no good reason for thinking that τοῦτο has here the force of διὰ τοῦτο (" for this reason ").

¹⁰ Ideo hæc absens scribo, ut non præsens durius agam, secundum potestatem, quam Dominus dedit mihi in ædificationem, et non in destructionem.

¹¹ De cetero, fratres, gaudete, perfecti estote, exhortamini, idem sapite, pacem habete, et Deus pacis et dilectionis erit vobiscum. ¹² Salutate invicem in osculo sancto, Salutant vos omnes sancti. ¹³ Gratia Do-

¹⁰ Therefore I write these things being absent, that, being present, I may not deal more severely, according to the power which the Lord hath given me unto edification, and not unto destruction.

¹¹ For the rest, brethren, rejoice, be perfect, take exhortation, be of one mind, have peace: and the God of peace and of love shall be with you. ¹² Salute one another in a holy kiss. All the saints salute you. ¹³ The grace of our Lord Jesus

10. He again (cf. xii. 19) points out his purpose in writing this epistle or perhaps the polemical portion of it beginning with x. 1. The words "according to the power, etc.," are to be connected with all that precedes in the verse, and not merely with the clause immediately preceding. In accordance with this mission to build up, not to destroy, he chose to write and have things set right in Corinth previous to his coming, rather than make a display of his power by punishing the unrepentant when he came.

11. This and the two verses that follow constitute the epilogue of the Epistle. "Rejoice"; some would render χαίρετε here by "farewell," but the Apostle nowhere else uses the word in that sense, and it is best understood of holy joy, which the Apostle reckons among the fruits of the Holy Ghost (cf. Gal. v. 22)—"Take exhortation," rather "be comforted"—see above on i. 4-7.—"Be of one mind, have peace." "Observe," says Estius, referring to 1 Cor. i. 10, "quam apte congruant quæ hic in fine secundæ epistolæ dicuntur Epilogi loco, cum iis, quæ dicta sunt in principio prioris. . . . Unde intelligimus, præcipuam Apostolorum curam in his epistolis scribendis fuisse, ut per concordiam et caritatem bene cohaererent animis inter se Corinthii, tanquam unius atque integri corporis membra."—"Of peace and of love"; the inverse order: "of love and of peace" is more probable.

12. "In a holy kiss." See on 1 Cor. xvi. 20. "All the saints" are all the Christians of the place from which he wrote, perhaps Philippi.

13. He adds his own salutation in the form of the most solemn benediction found anywhere in his epistles. As St. Thomas

mini nostri IESU CHRISTI, et
charitas Dei, et communicatio
sancti Spiritus sit cum omnibus
vobis. Amen.

CHRIST, and the charity of God,
and the communication of the
Holy Ghost be with you all.
Amen.

points out, the Apostle here wishes the Corinthians everything that is necessary : " gratia Christi, qua iustificamur et salvamur ; caritas Dei Patris, qua sibi unimur ; et communicatio Spiritus Sancti, divina nobis dona distribuentis." And this blessing he invokes, not upon particular individuals or sections, but upon them *all* (μὲν πάντων ὑμῶν). The blessing was probably given in this form in order to suggest the mystery of the Blessed Trinity, although the Father is not expressly named. At any rate, the Greek Fathers frequently appealed to this verse against the various Anti-Trinitarian heretics. The genuineness of the final " Amen " is very doubtful, as it is wanting in the three oldest Greek MSS. B & A. The subscription, found in many MSS., which names, perhaps correctly, Philippi as the place where the Epistle was written, must be regarded as spurious.

END

INDEX

- Abiron, 143.
 Accusative absolute, 325, 363.
 Achaia, 3. 280.
 Adam, 236; the last, 250, 251.
 Aeschyles, 303.
 Agape, 100, 109, 181, 182.
 Age, 14, 23; Messianic, 358.
 Amen, 215.
 Ambrose, St., 139, 426.
 Anabaptists, 31.
 Anathema, 186.
 Angels, 74, 164.
 Aorist, force of, 5, 63, 205, 290, 303, 345; epistolary, 129, 308, 351.
 Aorist participle, 147.
 Aphrodite, xiii, 150.
 Apollo, 9, 12, 35, 47, 53, 61, 265.
 Apostles, condition of, 58, 300.
 Apostles of the churches, 387.
 Apostles, "the great," 409, 433.
 Apostolic Constitutions, 268.
 Appearances of the risen Lord, 227-230.
 Aquila, 267.
 Aretas, 421.
 Arians, 117.
 Armour of Justice, 361.
 Asia, proconsular, 267.
 Assyrians, 217.
 Athens, xiii, xiv, 22, etc.
 Augustine, St., 36, 39, 56, 71, 99, 105, 125, 166, 193, 254, 257, 317, 352, 425, 430.
 Austerities, corporal, 135.
 Authenticity of the First Epistle, xviii; of the Second, 273.
 Authorised Version, 89, 102, 170, 193.
 ἄγανος, 93.
 ἀδόκιμος, 441.
 ἀπιστος, 108.
 αἰών, 14; 332.
 ἀμων, 130.
 ἄλλος, 188.
 ἀναγινώσκω, 294.
 ἀρετῶντινος, 145.
 ἀρτοφαι, 88.
 ἀσθενής, 102.
 ἀσχημονία, 110, 201.
 ἀπρόβωον, 290.
 Banquets, sacrificial, 150.
 Baptism, 10, 11, 78, 137, 354.
 Baptism for the dead, 240-242.
 Baptism of infants, 99.
 Barnabas, 128, 384, 385.
 Basket, 422.
 Batifol, 3, 169, 181.
 Beelen, 17, 29, 32, 115, 204, 253, 288, 319, 401, 409, 420.
 Belial, 385.
 Benedict XII, 205.
 Bengel, 419.
 Bisping, 97, 419.
 Bonaventure, St., 156.
 Brandscheid, 344, 424.
 Brethren of the Lord, 126.
 Brother, 2.
 Buffet, to, 428, 429.
 Burial of Christ, 227.
 βέβηπος, 213.
 βουβίον, 134.
 βρώμα, 121.
 Cajetan, 97, 205, 426.
 Calendar, 381.
 Called by God, 2, 16, 101, 102.
 Calmet, 96.
 Calvin on celibacy, 110; on the Sacraments, 138.
 Calvinists, 31.
 Canon of the Mass, 172.
 Carthage, third Council of, 166.
 Causa Apostoli, 97-102.
 Catholic Epistle, 4.
 Celibacy, 88, 92, 109, 110.
 Cephas, 8, 47, 125, 227.
 Chalice, consecrated, 147, 148, 175, 176.
 Characteristics of the Epistles, general, xxiii, 280.
 Charisma, 183 ff.
 Charity, the virtue of, 198-206.
 Chloe, 8.
 Christ, His vicarious death, 351, 352; see Divinity.
 Christians as "saints," 3.
 Christ party at Corinth, 8, 9.
 Chrysostom, St., 23, 39, 42, 71, 77, 88, 120, 141, 144, 152, 180, 183, 240, 241, 265, 268, 297, 341, 357, 364, 371, 397, 411, 424.
 Church, 2, 210.
 Church of Corinth, xiii-xviii.
 Cicero, xiii, 258.
 Circumcision, 102.
 Clement of Rome, St., 9, 53.
 Clement of Alexandria, 91, 124, 139, 426.
 Clothed upon, 345.
 Coadjutors of God, 37.
 Collection for the poor, 261, 370-395.

Commentaries, xxix, 283.
 Communion under both kinds, 178.
 Communions, unworthy, 178.
 Conscience, erroneous, 118.
 Conybeare and Howson, xxix, 197, 283.
 Core, 143.
 Corinth, xxiii; church of, xiii-xviii.
 Corluy, 253.
 Cornely, 16, 24, 33, 37, 51, 54, 64, 75, 83, 97, 127, 151, 156, 160, 172, 178, 189, 194, 200, 201, 222, 238, 256, 307, 311, 323, 344, 349, 350, 354, 377, 386, 429, 433, 437, etc.
 Counsel, 104, 156.
 Crispus, 11.
 Cross of Christ, 12.
 Cyprian, St., 139.
 Cyril of Alexandria, St., 97.
 Cyril of Jerusalem, St., 139.
 Damascus, 123, 421.
 Date of the Epistles, xxii, 279, 381, 422.
 Dathan, 143.
 Day of judgment, 40-44.
 Deacon, 385.
 Debt of marriage, 89.
 Deissmann, 2, 152, 237, 261.
 Demoniacal possession, 65.
 Densinger, 173, 205, 348.
 Devices, Satan's, 310.
Didache, xvii, 10, 148, 208, 269.
 Dispensation, glory of the new, 319-322.
 Divinity of Christ, 4, 32, 38, 232, 298, 380.
 Divorce, 95, 96.
 Drach., 97.
Εαυρόνιον, 150.
Εέναν, 169.
Εαίρεσις, 186.
Εισαγωγή, 187; 320, 330.
Εέναντες, 168.
Εάφο, 162.
 Earnest of the Spirit, 299, 347.
 Easter, 381; see Pasch.
 Encyclopedia, the Catholic, ix.
 Ends of the world, 143.
 Ephesus, 8, 244, 276, etc.
 Erasmus, 102, 281, 419.
 Eschatology, 40-44. 105, 106, 256, 257, 342-349.
 Estius, 4, 23, 24, 54, 65, 67, 78, 97, 102, 112, 119, 130, 132, 144, 145, 155, 172, 197, 202, 242, 248, 253, 257, 260, 290, 305, 332, 334, 354, 355, 362, 377, 380, 398, 443, etc.
 Ethnarch, 421, 422.
 Eucharist, Blessed, 20, 148, 160, 182.
 Euripides, 202.

Eusebius, 91, 139.
 Exodus, Jews of, 136, 137.
Εγείρεται, 227.
Εί μή, 101.
Εκβαλόν, 119.
Εκβαλόν, 115.
Εκδοχή, 2, 221.
Εκών, 130.
Εκπλες, 16.
Εκουσία, 163.
Εκδοχή, 141.
Εκπλες, 306.
Εκπλες, 304.
Εκπλες, 188.
Εκλογίω, 171.
Εκχαριστία, 171.
 Factions at Corinth, 8, 53.
 Faith, 399; Protestant theory of, 51.
 Fasting, 118, 300, 418.
 Feije, 98, 101.
 Fickleness, charge of, 295, 300.
 First plural in Second Epistle, 287, 288.
 Flesh and blood, 254.
 Florence, Council of, 42, 44, 173, 348.
 Fornication, 63, 80-85, 437.
 Funk, xvii, 273.
 Gaius, xv, 11.
 Gallic, 64.
 Genitive, objective, 6; subjective, 351; of apposition, 300, 312, 343.
 Gifts, spiritual, 183 ff.
 Gnosticism, 5.
 Grace, 4; necessity of, 34; amissibility of, 135, 136, 144, 202, 203; sufficiency of, 145.
 Gregory the Great, St., 39.
 Gregory of Nazianzus, St., 430.
 Grimm, 14, 38, 111, 151, 162, 192, 194, 212, 214, 227, 289, 291, 301, 313, 328, 331, 345, 348, 350, 390, 396, 403, 418, 422, 426, 430, 440, etc.
γυνή, 345.
γυνή, 88, 124, 160.
 Hair, 165.
 Harlot, 82.
 Harnack, xxii.
 Hasting's Dictionary of the Bible, xxii, 169, 208, 273.
 Hausrath, 304.
 Heaven, the third, 425.
 Helvidius, 125.
 Heresies, 168.
 Hermes, 208.
 Hierarchy at Corinth, xvii, 195.
 Husbandry, God's, 38.

- Idolatry, 146.
 Idolothytes, or meats offered to idols, 113-118, 152.
 Idols, 72, 113, 116.
 Ignatius of Antioch, St., xviii, 91, 244.
 Image of God, 102, 333.
 Incestuous Corinthian, 63-67, 305-310.
 Infant Baptism, 100.
 Innocent X, 146.
 Inspiration, St. Paul's, 97, 112, 415.
 Integrity of the First Epistle, xix ; of the Second, 273.
 Intercourse, social, with pagans, 70.
 Interpretation of Tongues, 189.
 Irenaeus, St., xix, 139, 205, 273.
Irish Theological Quarterly, 226.
 Irony, 58, 222, 415, 433.
 Isaiah, 13, 26, 32, 227, 244, 355, 358, 366, 367.
 Israel, 149, 326 ; the children of, 319, 323.
 Isthmian games, xiii, 134.
 Ἰσθμιαί, 214, 215, 218, 219.
 ἱππόδρον, 153.
 Iva with subj. having imper. force, 107, 379.

 Jacquier, 282.
 James the Less, 228.
 Jansenius, 146.
 Jeremias, 19, 366.
 Jerome, St., 97, 124, 229, 259, 410, 411, 431.
 Jerusalem, Council of, 118, 157, 158 ; poor Christians of, 261, 376.
 Jewish priests, 128.
 Job, book of, 48.
 Josephus, 421.
 Judge, Christ as, 52, 75, 348, 349.
 Judgment, last, 40-43, 105, 257, 348, 349.
 Justice, not merely imputed, 19, 79, 356, 357.
 Justin Martyr, St., 139, 169.

 Kingdom, the Messianic, 237, 238.
 Kiss, a holy, 268, 443.
 Knabenbauer, 26.
 καθώς, 5.
 κανόν, 208.
 κανών, 403.
 καταρτίζω, 7.
 καταργέω, 202.
 καταγράφω, 108, 131.
 κλήρημα, 389.
 κλήρησις, 293.
 κηρύσσω, 135.
 κλέω, 175.
 κλητός, 16.
 κληρώ, 180.
 κωνσταντία, 147.
 κολάω, 83.
 κείρω, 443.
 κρησίνω, 385.

 Lapide, Cornelius A., 30, 30, 54, 74, 96, 156, 426, etc.
 Lateran Council, 126.
 Latin in the liturgy, 214.
 Law, Mosaic, 127, 132, 200, 318.
 Law, the, 210.
 Lawsuits, 73-76.
 Leaven, 67, 69, 69.
 Levites, 128.
 Liberty, Christian, 80, 100, 103, 327.
 Lightfoot, xxii, xxix.
 Luther, 75.
 λυτροσύνη, 393.
 λαμβάνω, 107.
 λαός, 261.

 Macedonia, 203, 295, 311, 360, 376, 411.
 MacEvilly, 28, 115, 214.
 Manicheans, 332.
 Manna, 137, 382.
 Mansi, 42.
 Maran Atha, 269.
 Marcion, xix.
 Marriage, 87 ; indissolubility of, 94, 95 ; mixed, 96-102.
 Martyrdom, 200.
 Mass, the, 151.
 M'Carthy, 173, 360, 419.
 Meats offered to idols, 113-118, 157.
 Menander, 245.
 Menzies, 274, 304.
 Merit of good works, 37, 42, 340.
 Middle voice, 78, 195, 289.
 Ministers of Christ, 35, 49.
 Miracles, 189, 432, 433.
 Mirrors, 204.
 Moab, daughters of, 141, 142.
 Moses, 137, 139, 320, 321, 322, 323.
 Moulton, J. H., 18, 107, 184, 206, 247, 335, 355, 387, 392, 415.
 Mysteries of God, 50.
 μέντοι, 78.
 μισήσω, 194.
 μισέω, 372.
 μιστήριον, 49, 209.

 Natural man, the, 30.

 Object of the First Epistle, xx ; of the Second, 277.
 Occasion of the First Epistle, xx ; of the Second, 276.
 Oecumenius, 97, 124.
 Orange, Second Council of, 56, 317.
 Ordain, 384, 385.

- Origen, 217.
οὐρανός, 119.
ἔσθω, 230.
οὐ and *μή*, 18.
ἐν *ἐν* with infinitive, 401.
- Paradise, 426.
 Parents and the marriage of their daughters, 110, 111.
 Pasch, festival of, 69.
 Paul, St., his Apost. authority, 61, 67, 97, 112, 123, 300, 399, 440; his celibate life, 93; his corporal austerities, 135; his conversion, 123, 229; his personal appearance, 402; his manual labour, 410, 411, 418; his claims and sufferings, 415-422; his visions, 424-427; his sting of the flesh, 428-430.
- Peace, 4, 101, 221.
 Pelagians, 56, 317, 352.
 Perfect tense, 3, 24, 227, 291, 431.
 Perrone, 105, 214, 352.
 Peter, St., 8, 125; see Cephas.
 Philo, 407.
 Photius, 379.
 Plan of the First Epistle, xx; of the Second, 277-279.
 Plato, 345.
 Plural, first person, 287, 288.
 Preachers, 12.
 Precept and counsel, 104, 105.
 Priests, Jewish, 128.
 Princes of this world, 23, 24.
 Principal efficient cause expressed by *ἕκαστος* with genitive, 7.
 Priscilla, 267, 268.
 Prophecy, 189, 208-223.
 Purgatory, 44.
παιδαγωγός, 60.
παρεκάλει, 287, 307.
πατήρ, 104.
παρρησία, 237.
παύσηται, 322.
μή with and without article following, 286.
μή, 21.
πνευματικός, 30, 184, 249.
παρά, 63, 64.
πρόσωπον, 292, 334.
παρά, 325.
πορεύς, 29, 30, 249.
- Quotations from Old Testament, xxvi, 282.
- Ramsay, xxix, 163.
 Real Presence, 173, 176, 178.
 Redemptory character of Christ's death, 86, 227, 352.
 Resurrection, doctrine of the, 81, 226-240; of Christ, 81, 227-235, 338, 353.
- Reward, as a motive of action, 133, 339, 340.
 Revised Version, 26, 45, 58, 75, 77, 89, 109, 110, 124, 141, 163, 179, 193, 203, 204, 226, 246, 297, 301, 305, 322, 355, 371, 375, 383, 392, 434, etc.
 Rickaby, 112, 150, 164, 168, 210, 313, 381.
 Robertson-Plummer, 38, 153, 209, 210, 224, 230, etc.
 Rock, spiritual, 138-140.
- Sacrifice of the Eucharist, 147, 148, 151.
 Saints, called to be, 3.
 Sanchez, 98.
 Satan, 65, 66, 67, 70, 428; "god of this world," 331.
 Schisms, 7, 168.
 Schleusner, 38, 63.
 Scrivener, 344.
 Semipelagians, 56, 317.
 Semler, 273.
 Sennacherib, 13.
 Sensual man, the, 29.
 Septuagint, 13, 19, 26, 32, 46, 72, 100, 152, 217, 239, 244, 250, 321, 323, 326, 332, 338, 343, 304, 306, 382, 386, 389, 391, 426, 438, etc.
 Silvanus, 298.
 Slavery, 103.
 Sostrhenes, 2.
 Sozomen, 106.
 Spirit, Holy, 28, 44, 85, 86.
 Spiritual man, the, 30.
 Spiritual body, 249, 250, 252, 344.
 Stanley, x, 209, 363, 375, 415, 434, 439.
 Stephanas, 11, 266, 267.
 Style of First Epistle, xxiv; of Second, 281.
 Suarez, 257.
 Supper, the Lord's, 168, 169.
σπινθήρ and *σπινθίς*, 30.
συνέβαλον, 121.
σάββατον, 426.
συνάγωγα, 363.
εἴρη, 108.
- Table of the Lord, 151.
 Tacitus, 162.
 Temple of God, 45, 305.
 Tertullian, xix, 97, 124, 139, 141, 169, 205, 242, 255, 257, 273, 275, 305.
 Testament, 318.
 Text, authorities for, xxvi, 282.
Textus Receptus, 371.
 Theodore, 97, 124, 321.
 Theophylact, 69, 124.
 Third day, the, 227.

- Thomas, St., 25, 47, 56, 60, 62, 81, 83, 97, 111, 146, 156, 167, 172, 174, 193, 307, 333, 349, 368, 426, 443, etc.
- Thomists and Scotists, 156.
- Timothy, St., 60, 264, 265, 285, 286, 294, 378, etc.
- Titus, 311, 370, 374, 379, 383, 396, 434, etc.
- Tongues, gift of, 207-224.
- Transubstantiation, 148, 173.
- Trent, Council of, 37, 50, 51, 79, 82, 133, 144, 146, 151, 171, 175, 179, 203, 340, 356, 441, etc.
- Trinity, doctrine of the, 79, 167, 444.
- Troas, 310, 369.
- Trumpet, the last, 258.
- Types, 137, 138, 140.
- τύλος, 324.
- τυπικὸς, 140, 143.
- ἡάτρον, 57.
- ἐλπίς, 335.
- ἐπιμαρτύρω, 311.
- ἐπιμαρτύριον, 149.
- Until, sense of in Scripture, 238.
- Utterance, 5.
- ὀπίσσω, 111.
- ὀνομασία, 135.
- Van Steenkiste, xxix, 139.
- Veil, use of the, 160-165.
- Vetus Italia*, 45, 142, 171, 231, 208, 309, 344, 351, 374, 400, etc.
- Virginity, 104-107.
- Vocabulary of the Epistles, xxv, 282.
- Vulgate, 6 (passim).
- Vulgate text of 1 Cor. xv. 51, 256.
- Weizsäcker, 280.
- Westcott and Hort, 109, 184, 199, 344, 371.
- Widows, 93, 94, 112.
- Winer, 70, 288, 415.
- Wisdom, the higher, 34.
- Wives of the Apostles, 124, 125.
- World, the, 14.
- Zahn, 269, 288, 294, 381.
- Zeugma, 34.
- Zeus, 150.
- ζηλόω, 197.